DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 091 823 EA 006 177

TITLE	An Evaluation of School-Community Advisory Councils/1972.
INSTITUTION	Los Angeles City Schools, Calif. Office of Education and Management Assessment.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	120p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$5.40 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Advisory Committees; *Citizen Participation; Community Control; Community Involvement; *Decentralization; Decision Making; *Program Evaluation; School Systems; Surveys; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*Los Angeles

ABSTRACT

A major component of the decentralization concept has been the focus on the participation of community, staff, and students in the process of educational decision making. On June 28, 1971, the Los Angeles City Board of Education mandated that a school-community advisory council be established in every regular elementary and secondary school in the district. To evaluate the performance of those councils, survey questionnaires were sent to all school principals and advisory council chairmen; and to selected council members, parents, teachers, community representatives, and students. This report contains (1) a presentation of the statistical information compiled from all the respondents who returned one of the questionnaires; (2) an analysis of the open-ended response questions in an effort to summarize the many points of view in terms of identified strengths, weaknesses, or recommendations; and (3) an attempt to evaluate council effectiveness based on such factors as council structure, involvement, cooperation, and experience. Based on these three related but separate approaches to an analysis of the data, a number of specific conclusions and recommendations are presented. (Author/JF)

ED 091823

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AN EVALUATION OF SCHOOL-COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCILS / 1972

EA 006 177

PREPARED BY

OFFICE OF EDUCATION AND MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
SECTION I	Introduction	1
SECTION II	Characteristics of Advisory Councils	5
	Survey Questionnaire	5
	Short-Form Questionnaire	25
SECTION III	Open-Ended Responses	33
	Survey Questionnaire	33
	Short-Form Questionnaire	43
SECTION IV	Factors Related to Council Effectiveness	49
SECTION V	Conclusions and Recommendations	63
SECTION VI	Appendices	
	Appendix A	
	Preliminary Evaluation Efforts	
	Appendix B	
	Survey Questionnaire	
	Short-Form Questionnaire	

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

A major component of the decentralization concept has been the focus on the participation of community, staff and students in the process of educational decision-making.

On June 28, 1971, the Los Angeles City Board of Education mandated that a school-community advisory council be established and in operation by December 1, 1971, in every regular elementary and secondary school in the district. Recognizing the inseparability of progress in evolving effective councils and periodic evaluations, the guidelines for the implementation of Board Rule 1370 provided for an "evaluation of...all existing councils by the end of the School Year 1971-72, and all new councils...by the end of the second year of their existence."

In order to undertake the evaluation effort, the Office of Education and Management Assessment, working with area superintendents and school principals, developed and distributed three preliminary questionnaires in order to obtain some specific data concerning council organization, structure and operation. The information received was presented to the Board of Education as progress reports on the status of the newly mandated councils on January 10, March 23, and April 20, 1972. (Appendix A)

On February 24, 1972, the chairman of the Community Affairs Committee of the Board of Education, appointed an ad hoc committee of six persons from the staff and community to work with the Office of Education and Management Assessment in developing an evaluative instrument for measuring the effectiveness of advisory councils in accord with Board Rule 1370. This committee developed an initial pool of topical information areas from

which questions were designed to meet the objectives of identifying needs, priorities, weaknesses and strengths common to advisory councils. The preliminary draft of the survey questionnaire was sent to nearly two hundred professional and community representatives throughout the district for suggestions and, after studying the returned responses, the committee developed the final revisions of the survey. (Appendix B)

PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

Based on the content and guidelines of Board Rule 1370 and the emphases reflected in the survey instrument, the primary objectives of the evaluation of advisory councils were considered to be:

1. To describe council organization, structure and operation in the Los Angeles Unified School District.
2. To assess the degree of discrepancy between how advisory councils should function (according to the guidelines associated with Board Rule 1370) and how, in fact, they do function.
3. To identify those factors which seemed closely related to the effectiveness of advisory councils.

SELECTION OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS

It was recognized early in the process of selecting respondents that, with the large number of elementary and secondary schools in the district, a sampling procedure would be required to keep data analysis at a manageable level. It was considered essential that all school principals and advisory council chairmen should be included in the survey. In addition, the following randomly selected advisory council members were also included: one parent, one teacher, and one community representative from each school, one student from each secondary school, and one classified

employee from each school where that representation existed. Almost 3,200 questionnaires were mailed and 1,396 were returned.

Table 1-I Number of Survey Questionnaires Sent and Returned

	Chairmen	Parents	Community Representatives	Students	Principals	Certificated Staff	Classified Staff	Total
SENT	560	560	560	124	560	560	250	3174
	56.8%				43.2%			
RETURNED	286	193	87	22	462	279	67	1396
	42.1%				57.9%			44%

SHORT-FORM QUESTIONNAIRE

In response to a subsequent recommendation of the ad hoc committee to provide an opportunity for voluntary input from community and staff not involved in the initial survey, a much shorter questionnaire was developed (Appendix B). Similar in format to the longer version, quantities of this form were sent to schools and to community and professional organizations.

As a result of this effort, over 1,100 additional responses were received from community and staff members who desired to express their points of view about the advisory council concept as a result of either their direct or indirect involvement.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

An enormous quantity of information about the organization, structure and operation of community advisory councils was provided by the data accumulated from these two questionnaires. With the exception of the open-ended questions, a large proportion of the responses on the Survey Questionnaires was computer processed. The 1,126 short-form questionnaires

were entirely hand-tabulated. The open-ended questions in both questionnaires were individually evaluated and categorized. The major task then was to systematize this quantity of data into a form that would yield significant information related to the evaluation of council effectiveness.

The nature of such an assessment--involving 560 school-community advisory councils with diverse and changing needs, concerns and roles--required judgments in regard to the information which could logically be included in the body of the report. In the following sections, therefore, three distinct emphases are reflected from the data provided by this survey:

1. A presentation of the statistical information compiled from all of the respondents who returned one of the questionnaires.
2. An analysis of the open-ended response questions in an effort to summarize the many points of view in terms of identified strengths, weaknesses or recommendations.
3. An attempt to evaluate council effectiveness based on such factors as council structure, involvement, cooperation and experience.

Based on these three related but separate approaches to an analysis of this quantity of data, a number of specific conclusions and recommendations are presented in Section V for consideration and essential future planning.

CHARACTERISTICS OF ADVISORY COUNCIL ORGANIZATION, STRUCTURE AND OPERATION

With the quantity of statistical data that was compiled from the survey forms of respondents, it was possible to develop a very descriptive composite of advisory councils. These data are not intended to reflect an "ideal" council, but rather what tends to be a typical council for the more than 560 elementary and secondary schools of the district.

In terms of response to the questionnaire, it was encouraging that 44% of those receiving the survey had returned it. It was anticipated that a higher percentage of advisory chairmen would respond, but the 50% return certainly provided an adequate statistical base for a valid analysis. Overall the response from community members, including chairmen and parents, was very encouraging. Only the student response (18%) was somewhat disappointing.

Recognizing that unique community needs would affect the design of the advisory council, Board Rule 1370 provided considerable latitude in meeting the provisions of the mandate and in determining council organization, structure and operation. Schools were permitted to work cooperatively with staff, parents, community representatives and pupils at the secondary level to decide upon a mutually acceptable plan for a school-community advisory group.

In organizing advisory councils in accord with the mandate of the Board rule, school staff faced the responsibility of informing their school communities about the requirements of the new rule. This was accomplished primarily by personal contacts and by information sent home by pupils. Seventy-nine percent of the respondents to the survey indicated they were well-informed regarding the provisions of Board

Rule 1370. As a result, 89% of the schools had formed their councils under the new guidelines by the deadline date of December 1, 1971.

Although almost 20% of the schools had not had any form of advisory council prior to the adoption of the Board rule, almost half of the schools (47%) had maintained some form of council for two or more years before they became mandatory. Eighty-one percent of the respondents indicated, however, that their schools had either formed a new council or redefined their existing council structure in accord with the provisions of Rule 1370.

The Handbook for School-Community Advisory Councils was published as a resource book which could be used by council members as a guide to the organization of their councils. It suggested guidelines for the effective operation of councils within the framework of established Board policy. Although one-third of the respondents were members of councils formed before the publication became available, 31% of the members had handbooks and "depended on (them) heavily"; an additional 30% used the handbook "in a general way."

Smaller numbers of community members than might have been desired turned out to assist in the planning process to establish the new councils. This may be one of the reasons why many respondents expressed concern about community apathy in the questionnaire. Nonetheless, the procedures used to select members, as well as chairmen, elicited little negative reaction. Nomination at an open meeting was the most common method (35%) of qualifying for membership and almost 80% of all advisory council members were elected according to the respondents. Chairmen head the list with 95% elected, closely followed by students (90%), certificated staff (87%) and parents (86%).

An analysis of the membership composition of the councils indicates that women are predominant in the advisory councils district-wide (66%), but that

the figure is exactly reversed in regard to the role of chairmen where 66% are men. Although racial minorities tend to be under-represented in comparison with the statistics in the Racial and Ethnic Survey, Fall, 1971, the major variation appears in the certificated staff group where 78% are represented as "Other White" in comparison with the district-wide pupil percentage of 47.7%.

The typical advisory council meets monthly (89%), in the evening (81%), with approximately 11-25 members in attendance, but generally fewer than 10 non-members present. Most councils (74%) have adopted and are using bylaws to define their operating procedures and based on responses received in June, only 35 councils (8%) were functioning without bylaws. Minutes of meetings are kept by almost all councils and, in most instances, are read at the subsequent council meeting.

The most serious concern voiced in regard to council operation was the lack of funds for general expenses. Almost 31% of the councils reported that none was available for this purpose and 40% indicated that the use of school supplies was the only way of meeting this critical need. The 1972-73 budget authorization for this purpose, although small, will help to offset this problem.

In summary, it does seem possible to generalize that, although there are areas in which needs and problems are apparent, most advisory councils are organized and functioning in a manner which parallels that envisioned in Board Rule 1370 and its accompanying guidelines. The tables which follow are arranged in the sequence in which the questions of the survey form were presented to the respondents and they indicate a portion of the substantial quantity of statistical data which has been compiled as a result of this first district-wide evaluation effort.

Table 1-II Distribution of Questionnaires Sent and Returned by Administrative Areas

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	Did Not Indicate
NUMBER SENT	348	292	270	252	247	195	225	256	243	257	273	316	
NUMBER RETURNED	157	104	68	109	86	73	80	110	117	118	122	134	118
PERCENT	45%	36%	25%	43%	35%	38%	36%	43%	48%	46%	45%	42%	

Table 2-II Distribution of Questionnaires Sent and Returned by School Level

	Elementary	Junior High	Senior High	Did Not Indicate
NUMBER SENT	2362	484	328	
NUMBER RETURNED	1007	202	125	62
PERCENT	43%	42%	38%	

Table 3-II Distribution of Questionnaires Sent and Returned by Respondents

	Chairmen	Parents	Community Representatives	Students (Secondary only)	Principals	Certificated Staff	Classified Staff
NUMBER SENT	560	560	560	124	560	560	250
NUMBER RETURNED	286	193	87	22	462	279	67
PERCENT	51%	31%	16%	18%	83%	50%	27%

Table 4-II The Most Effective Method Used to Inform Council Members About the Requirement That an Official Advisory Council Was to Be Formed This Year

	School Staff (Informal Contact)	School Notice Sent by U.S.Mail	School Notice Sent Home by Pupils	PTA or Other Parent Group Notice	Newspaper	Not Informed	Other
NUMBER	549	96	388	131	132	7	208
PERCENT	36%	6%	26%	9%	9%	Less than .5%	14%

Table 5-II How Well Council Members Were Informed About Board Rule 1370

	Very Well	Somewhat	Poorly	Not at All
NUMBER	994	199	51	21
PERCENT	79%	16%	4%	1%

Table 6-II When School's Council Was Formed Under the Guidelines Presented in Board Rule 1370

	Before December 1, 1971	After December 1, 1971	Don't Know
NUMBER	395	44	2
PERCENT	89%	10%	1%

Table 7-II Amount of Time Before Adoption of Board Rule 1370 That Schools Had Some Form of Advisory Council

	Length of Time				
	Under Two Years	Two to Four Years	Five Years or More	Never	Don't Know
NUMBER	145	188	23	82	9
PERCENT	32%	42%	5%	19%	2%

Table 8-II Number of People Who Turned Out for Meetings to Plan Advisory Councils

	Under 25	25-50	51-100	Over 100	Don't Know	No Meeting Held
NUMBER	202	161	47	13	21	6
PERCENT	45%	36%	10%	3%	5%	1%

Table 9-II Extent District's Handbook for School-Community Advisory Councils Was Used in Establishing or Reorganizing Advisory Councils Under Board Rule 1370

	Council Formed Before Handbook Was Printed	Handbook Not Available	Handbook Available But Did Not Use	Used Only in a General Way	Depended on Heavily
NUMBER	402	50	27	368	375
PERCENT	33%	4%	2%	30%	31%

Table 10-II Procedures Whereby a Person Could Qualify as a Candidate for Advisory Council Membership (Multiple response permitted)

	Procedures						
	File Application	Submit Signed Petition	Submit Biographical Data to Voters	Nomination by Attending an Open Meeting	Secure Approval from Principal	Live in Specified Area	Other
NUMBER	517	114	217	805	61	445	153
PERCENT	22%	5%	9%	35%	3%	19%	7%

Table 11-II Procedures Used to Select Advisory Council Members

	Appointed	Elected by Ballot at Announced Meeting	Elected by Vote at Polls	Elected by Open Vote at Meeting (hand/voice)	Other
NUMBER	168	185	105	237	102
PERCENT	21%	23%	13%	30%	13%

Table 12-II Procedure Used to Select Advisory Council Chairmen

		Elected by:				
	Appointed	Mail Ballot	Ballot Vote at Announced Meeting	Open Vote at Meeting (hand/voice)	Continued as Chairman From an Earlier Council	Other
NUMBER	14	6	153	242	22	14
PERCENT	3%	1%	34%	54%	5%	3%

Table 13-II Amount of Participation That Occurred in Advisory Council Elections

COUNCIL MEMBERS	ELECTION TURNOUT				Appointed or No Election Held
	Very Little	Adequate	Large	Don't Know	
a. Advisory Council Chairmen	228 22%	500 49%	202 20%	28 3%	65 6%
b. Parents	431 36%	564 47%	140 12%	31 2%	41 3%
c. Community Representatives	503 46%	361 33%	66 6%	44 5%	112 10%
d. School Support Groups (e.g., PTA Booster Clubs, etc.)	276 26%	492 46%	112 10%	78 7%	119 11%
e. Certificated School Staff	162 14%	587 51%	255 22%	79 7%	74 6%
f. Classified School Staff	373 39%	284 30%	77 7%	102 11%	121 13%
g. Students	255 38%	144 22%	53 8%	57 9%	154 23%

ADVISORY COUNCIL STRUCTURE

Table 14-II Type of Advisory Councils Now in District Schools

	Council Is Newly Formed	Council Has Remained as It Was Prior to Board Rule 1370	Existing Councils Reorganized by Appointment or Election of Additional Members	Don't Know
NUMBER	168	84	203	1
PERCENT	37%	18%	44%	1%

Table 15-II Distribution of Advisory Council Membership by Sex for the District

TYPE OF MEMBER	SEX	
	Male	Female
Advisory Council Chairmen	304 66%	155 34%
Parents	1573 32%	3355 68%
Community Representatives	313 50%	316 50%
School Support Groups	129 14%	759 86%
Certificated School Staff	540 34%	1029 66%
Classified School Staff	49 21%	183 79%
Students	123 48%	136 52%
Totals	3031 34%	5933 66%

Table 16-II Distribution of Advisory Council Membership by Racial/Ethnic Background for the District

TYPE OF MEMBER	RACIAL/ETHNIC BACKGROUND					
	American Indian	Black	Oriental	Spanish Surname	Filipino & Other	White (Others)
Advisory Council Chairmen	1 .2%	84 19.1%	12 2.7%	69 15.7%	6 1.4%	268 60.9%
Parents	7 .1%	1270 26.2%	169 3.5%	1046 21.6%	27 .6%	2324 48.0%
Community Represent-atives	2 .3%	138 22.1%	19 3.0%	103 16.5%	4 .6%	358 57.4%
School Support Groups	0 0.0%	117 15.1%	25 3.2%	111 14.3%	2 .3%	520 67.1%
Certificated School Staff	2 .1%	200 13.5%	36 2.4%	73 4.9%	13 .9%	1155 78.1%
Classified School Staff	0 0.0%	87 31.4%	6 2.2%	58 20.9%	2 .7%	124 44.8%
Students	0 0.0%	54 17.4%	12 3.9%	81 26.1%	3 1.0%	160 51.6%
Totals	12 .1%	1950 22.3%	279 3.2%	1541 17.6%	57 .7%	4909 56.1%
(District Pupil Ethnicity)*	(.2%)	(24.8%)	(3.4%)	(22.7%)	(1.2%)	(47.7%)

*Los Angeles City Schools, Racial and Ethnic Survey, Fall, 1971.

Table 17-II Advisory Councils Having Subcommittees

	Yes	No
NUMBER	261	141
PERCENT	67%	33%

Table 18-II Distribution of Advisory Council Membership by the Method of Selection for the District

TYPE OF MEMBER	HOW SELECTED	
	Elected	Appointed
Advisory Council Chairman	425 95%	22 5%
Parents	4192 86%	653 14%
Community Representatives	405 64%	223 36%
School Support Groups	509 59%	351 41%
Certificated School Staff	1286 87%	189 13%
Classified School Staff	190 82%	42 18%
Students	213 90%	24 10%
Total	7220 83%	1504 17%

COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL OPERATION

Table 19-II Estimated Number of Advisory Council Members Who Usually Attend Regularly Scheduled Advisory Council Meetings

	Under 10	11-25	26-50	Over 50
NUMBER	80	346	31	3
PERCENT	17%	75%	7%	1%

Table 20-II Estimated Number of Non-Council Members Who Usually Attend Regularly Scheduled Advisory Council Meetings

	Under 10	11-25	26-50	51-100	Over 100	Don't Know
NUMBER	346	77	25	4	0	2
PERCENT	76%	17%	6%	1%	0%	Less than .5%

Table 21-II Present Stage of Development of Bylaws (Operating Procedures) for Advisory Councils

	Adopted and in Use	Being Developed	Being Revised	Undeveloped as Yet	No Plans to Develop	Don't Know
NUMBER	342	63	21	30	4	1
PERCENT	74%	14%	5%	7%	Less than .5%	Less than .5%

Table 22-II Frequency of Advisory Council Meetings

	Weekly	Every Two Weeks	Monthly	Every Two Months	Others
NUMBER	1	7	414	19	25
PERCENT	Less than .5%	2%	89%	4%	5%

Table 23-II Time of Advisory Council Meetings

	Day	Evening	Both
NUMBER	48	382	42
PERCENT	10%	81%	9%

Table 24-II The Most Effective Ways of Informing Council Members About Meetings

	Methods							
	Notice Sent Home With Pupils	U.S. Mail	Tele-phone	News-paper	School Notice/ Meeting	Council, PTA or Other Parent Group Notice	School Staff (Informal Contact)	Other
NUMBER	652	325	202	81	184	100	84	65
PERCENT	38%	19%	12%	5%	11%	6%	5%	4%

Table 25-II Opportunity for Non-Council Members to Participate in Discussion of Topics at Advisory Council Meetings

	Opportunity Always Exists	Opportunity Usually Exists	Opportunity Sometimes Exists	Opportunity Does Not Exist
NUMBER	1161	74	22	10
PERCENT	91%	6%	2%	1%

Table 26-II Opportunity for Non-Council Members to Introduce Topics for Discussion at Advisory Council Meetings

	Opportunity Always Exists	Opportunity Usually Exists	Opportunity Sometimes Exists	Opportunity Does Not Exist
NUMBER	1064	126	53	28
PERCENT	84%	10%	4%	2%

Table 27-II Opportunity for Non-Council Members to Serve on Subcommittees

	Opportunity Always Exists	Opportunity Usually Exists	Opportunity Sometimes Exists	Opportunity Does Not Exist
NUMBER	692	134	111	251
PERCENT	58%	11%	10%	21%

Table 28-II Procedures Used in Publicizing the Minutes of Advisory Council Meetings (Multiple response permitted)

	Minutes Are Recorded and Available at School	Minutes Are Recorded and Read at the Next Advisory Council Meeting	Minutes Are Mailed to Advisory Council Members	No Minutes Are Kept	Other
NUMBER	200	343	116	9	32
PERCENT	29%	49%	17%	1%	4%

Table 29-II Procedures Used in Distributing the Summaries of Advisory Council Meetings (Multiple response permitted)

	Summaries Are Sent Home With Pupils	Summaries Are Posted for Staff and Community to Read	Summaries Are Published in the Local Newspaper	No Summaries Are Prepared	Other
NUMBER	86	57	28	255	45
PERCENT	18%	12%	6%	54%	10%

Table 30-II Primary Source of Funds and/or Materials for the Operation of Advisory Councils

	None	Contributions from Council Members	Outside Donations	School Supplies	Title I	Area Office	Other
NUMBER	163	50	8	213	42	31	23
PERCENT	31%	9%	2%	40%	8%	6%	4%

REACTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Table 31-II Reaction to Procedure Used to Select Advisory Council Members

	Highly Satisfied	Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	Don't Know Procedures Used
NUMBER	461	599	150	48	4
PERCENT	36%	48%	12%	4%	Less than .5%

Table 32-II Sources of Dissatisfaction With Procedures Used to Select Members for Advisory Council Membership

	Election Controlled by a Small Group	Election Controlled by Principal	Eligible Voters Were Not Informed About Election	Voting Times Were Inconvenient	Not Dissatisfied	Other
NUMBER	82	24	25	7	514	111
PERCENT	11%	3%	3%	1%	67%	15%

Table 33-II Reaction to Procedure Used to Conduct Advisory Council Meetings

	Highly Satisfied	Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied
NUMBER	468	625	139	33
PERCENT	37%	49%	11%	3%

Table 34-II Opinions About Council Representativeness Regarding the Ethnic/Racial Composition of the School Student Body

	Highly Representative	Somewhat Representative	Not Representative	No Opinion
NUMBER	677	433	123	25
PERCENT	54%	34%	10%	2%

Table 35-II Opinions About the Frequency of Advisory Council Meetings

	Too Frequent	About Right	Not Frequent Enough	No Opinion
NUMBER	94	1085	74	10
PERCENT	7%	86%	6%	1%

Table 36-II Amount of Involvement of Advisory Councils Throughout the District

HAS YOUR ADVISORY COUNCIL:	AMOUNT DISCUSSED				
	Much	Some	Little	None	Don't Know
Participated in the identification of educational needs?	380 31%	580 47%	180 15%	73 6%	12 1%
Advised on the resource needs of schools (e.g., staff, materials, and funds)?	382 31%	452 37%	248 20%	136 11%	10 1%
Made recommendations regarding planning, development or improvement of school educational programs? (i.e., curriculum recommendations)	291 24%	500 41%	258 21%	160 13%	9 1%
Made budgetary recommendations to meet educational program needs?	143 12%	236 19%	310 26%	502 41%	25 2%
Participated in the definition of educational goals, objectives and priorities?	259 21%	423 35%	326 27%	190 16%	18 1%
Advised on the use of specific indicators that would show progress toward educational objectives (e.g., standardized tests, parent surveys)?	152 13%	305 25%	315 26%	400 33%	31 3%
Oriented and advised school staff regarding conditions in the community (e.g., vandalism, drug abuse)?	252 21%	415 34%	271 22%	256 21%	23 2%
Participated in the development of policies affecting the interests and welfare of pupils (e.g., discipline, homework, grading practices, etc.)?	297 24%	435 36%	246 20%	230 19%	14 1%
Facilitated school communication with parents and citizens? (i.e., school community relations)	315 26%	491 40%	282 23%	112 9%	17 1%
Assisted in securing the support and services of parents, teachers, and students? (i.e., mobilized public support for the school)	288 24%	449 37%	290 24%	173 14%	22 2%
Participated in the evaluation of the school and its academic effectiveness and made recommendations to the superintendent for improvement? (e.g., on reading achievement level)	110 9%	227 19%	274 22%	542 45%	65 5%
All Functions	2869 21%	4513 34%	3000 22%	2774 21%	246 2%

Table 37-II Effectiveness of Advisory Councils Throughout the District

HAS YOUR ADVISORY COUNCIL:	EFFECTIVENESS		
	Effective	Not Effective	Too Early to Evaluate
Participated in the identification of educational needs?	435 36%	179 15%	580 49%
Advised on the resource needs of schools (e.g., staff, materials, and funds)?	395 34%	249 21%	529 45%
Made recommendations regarding planning, development or improvement of school educational programs? (i.e., curriculum recommendations)	378 32%	212 18%	576 50%
Made budgetary recommendations to meet educational program needs?	198 18%	332 30%	576 52%
Participated in the definition of educational goals, objectives and priorities?	396 34%	217 19%	548 47%
Advised on the use of specific indicators that would show progress toward educational objectives (e.g., standardized tests, parent surveys)?	201 18%	297 27%	604 55%
Oriented and advised school staff regarding conditions in the community (e.g., vandalism, drug abuse)?	451 40%	253 22%	436 38%
Participated in the development of policies affecting the interests and welfare of pupils (e.g., discipline, homework, grading practices, etc.)?	483 42%	211 18%	463 40%
Facilitated school communication with parents and citizens? (i.e., school community relations)	549 47%	231 20%	385 33%
Assisted in securing the support and services of parents, teachers, and students? (i.e., mobilized public support for the school)	492 42%	256 22%	417 36%
Participated in the evaluation of the school and its academic effectiveness and made recommendations to the superintendent for improvement? (e.g., on reading achievement level)	170 16%	337 31%	576 53%
All Functions	4148 33%	2774 22%	5690 45%

Table 38-II Amount of Cooperation Among Council Members*

As Indicated by:	Principals	Chairmen	Parents	Community Representatives	Certificated Staff	Classified Staff	Students
Principals		1.20	1.32	1.30	1.22	1.14	1.27
Chairmen	1.19		1.41	1.36	1.31	1.43	1.48
Parents	1.55	1.62		1.77	1.73	1.84	1.76
Community Representatives	1.48	1.57	1.87		1.92	1.92	2.23
Certificated Staff	1.32	1.59	1.72	1.83		1.50	1.68
Classified Staff	1.23	1.37	1.45	1.40	1.33		1.27
Students	1.47	2.00	2.45	2.20	1.40	1.44	

*Rated on a median scale value of 1-4 with 1 = Excellent, 2 = Good, 3 = Average, 4 = Poor.

SHORT-FORM QUESTIONNAIRE

BACKGROUND

The single page "Questionnaire on School-Community Advisory Councils" (Appendix B) was developed in response to a request from the ad hoc committee responsible for the longer Survey Questionnaire. The purpose for this more concise questionnaire was to provide an opportunity for two other significant groups in the school community to share in the evaluation of advisory councils:

1. Advisory council members who were not included in the random sampling of the initial survey.
2. All other staff and community members of the school district who, though not members of advisory councils, were interested in participating in this evaluation of the councils.

Although it was much briefer, this questionnaire paralleled the survey which preceded it in organization, substance and format. Open-ended comments were again encouraged. Over 7,000 of these questionnaires with an explanatory letter to each respondent were distributed to elementary and secondary schools and to community organizations.

QUESTIONNAIRES RETURNED

Considering that these questionnaires were not addressed to specific individuals and that their return was entirely voluntary and anonymous, the return of over 1,100 questionnaires was gratifying.

Approximately 56% of the total came from the community (parents, students, and others who lived or worked in the school area), 40% were returned by certificated and classified staff, and the remaining 4% were not identified. A majority of the respondents (63%) identified themselves as advisory council members.

The percentages of response were distributed fairly evenly (5-9% range) among the twelve administrative areas:

Table A-II Distribution of Returned Questionnaires by Areas

AREA	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	Uniden-tified	Total
NUMBER	101	79	45	101	45	57	90	57	101	68	90	101	191	1126
PERCENT	9%	7%	4%	9%	4%	5%	8%	5%	9%	6%	8%	9%	17%	

Predictably, the highest percentage of returns came from respondents who were identified with elementary schools.

Table B-II Distribution of Returned Questionnaires by School Level

	Elementary	Junior High	Senior High	Other or Unidentified
NUMBER	707	220	160	39
PERCENT	63%	20%	14%	3%

PROCEDURE FOR EVALUATION

After all questionnaires were returned, responses were hand-tallied and grouped according to administrative areas, relationships of the respondents to the schools, school levels, and school size. Open-ended responses were read and assorted into appropriate categories.

The tables which follow present the statistical data that were compiled for this questionnaire. Since the information duplicates, to a large extent, that contained in the longer Survey Questionnaire, the analysis will be limited to those areas where significant deviation exists.

Table C-II To what extent do you feel the publicity related to the announcement of meetings, the publication of agenda, and the summaries of council business is effective?

	Very Effective	Adequate	Inadequate	No Opinion	Total Response
NUMBER	203	528	318	26	1075
PERCENT	19%	49%	30%	2%	

Table D-II To what extent were you satisfied with the attempt to follow the advisory council organization and operating procedures as established in Board Rule 1370?

	Highly Satisfied	Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatis-fied	Highly Dissatis-fied	Don't Know the Procedures in Board Rule 1370	Total Response
NUMBER	245	443	182	73	67	1110
PERCENT	22%	40%	16%	7%	15%	

Table E-II How are you informed about advisory council meetings? (Multiple response permitted)

	Number	Percent	Survey Questionnaire
Notice Sent Home With Pupil	567	31%	38%
U. S. Mail	265	15%	19%
Telephone	177	10%	12%
Newspaper	129	7%	5%
School Staff (Informal Contact)	327	18%	5%
Parent Group Newsletter	177	10%	6%
Other	174	10%	4%
Total Response	1816		

Table F-II What is your reaction to the procedure used to select advisory council members?

	Highly Satisfied	Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	Don't Know Procedures Used	Total Response
NUMBER	282	527	138	67	58	1072
PERCENT	26%	49%	13%	7%	5%	
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	36%	48%	12%	4%	Less than .5%	

Table G-II What is your reaction to the procedure used to select the advisory council chairman?

	Highly Satisfied	Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	Don't Know Procedures Used	Total Response
NUMBER	348	522	68	42	94	1074
PERCENT	32%	49%	6%	4%	9%	

Table H-II What is your reaction to the procedure used to conduct your advisory council meetings?

	Highly Satis-fied	Satis-fied	Somewhat Dissatis-fied	Highly Dissatis-fied	Don't Know Procedures Used	Total Response
NUMBER	290	448	187	81	41	1047
PERCENT	28%	43%	18%	8%	4%	
SURVEY QUESTION-NAIRE	37%	49%	11%	3%		

Table I-II In your opinion is your advisory council representative of the composition of the student body of your school?

	Highly Represent-ative	Somewhat Represent-ative	Not Represent-ative	No Opinion	Total Response
NUMBER	376	424	164	72	1036
PERCENT	36%	41%	16%	7%	
SURVEY QUESTION-NAIRE	54%	34%	10%		

Table J-II What opportunity do non-council members have to participate in the discussion of topics at advisory council meetings?

	Always Exists	Usually Exists	Sometimes Exists	Doesn't Exist	Total Response
NUMBER	749	188	115	18	1070
PERCENT	70%	18%	11%	2%	
SURVEY QUESTION-NAIRE	91%	6%	2%	1%	

Table K-II What opportunity do non-council members have to introduce topics for discussion at advisory council meetings?

	Always Exists	Usually Exists	Sometimes Exists	Doesn't Exist	Total Response
NUMBER	646	197	184	49	1076
PERCENT	60%	18%	17%	5%	
SURVEY QUESTION-NAIRE	84%	10%	4%	2%	

VARIATIONS IN RESPONSES

In six areas of the short questionnaire it is possible to establish comparisons with the longer survey form. In each instance, there is evidence of differing perceptions by respondents.

Concerns about notices of meetings, membership selection, meeting procedures, council representation and non-member participation were clearly more visible on the short-form questionnaire. Whether these reactions are from non-council members, or more importantly, from council members who feel they are not full participants in the advisory council process, these data reflect significant information if councils are to be effective.

Involvement still remains the number one priority and this requires that every effort is made to ensure that all members of the staff and community who desire, or can be encouraged, to participate should be provided a realistic opportunity to do so.

SUMMARY

The statistical data of the two questionnaires should be interpreted essentially as reference points for the principal and advisory council

chairman to assess in terms of the design and operation of their own council. Marked deviations should not necessarily be judged as evidences of weakness nor as a basis for change. Differing local school-community needs obviously require variations in terms of advisory council structure.

It is important, however, to evaluate such factors as election procedures, representativeness of the council (community, sex, ethnicity), time and frequency of meetings, non-member participation, agenda planning and other significant elements which constitute the operating procedures of an advisory council. If council effectiveness can be achieved with a number of procedural and organizational changes, these statistical data provide a resource base for such decisions. The emphasis is clear that a need exists for well-defined guidelines and administrative regulations, and for a program of in-service training that seeks to emphasize those things which other advisory councils have found helpful and successful. The opportunity for self-determination and adaptation to local needs can then prevail within a defined structure and, at the same time, in an atmosphere which encourages flexibility. This not only is a key element to a successful community participation effort, but also a successful decentralization process.

OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES

BACKGROUND

The problems of processing data obtained from open-ended free-response questions are apparent--particularly when they solicit judgmental appraisals of a procedure in which the respondent probably has been intellectually and emotionally involved. However, because no data in the entire questionnaire had greater significance, the development of an efficient method for scrutinizing, systematizing and summarizing this information was essential.

The respondents were given the opportunity to submit voluntary answers to the following:

A. Please state reasons why your council has been effective or ineffective this year.

B. Please make suggestions which you believe will improve your school-community advisory council.

Table 1-III Percentage of Respondents Responding to Open-Ended Questions

MEMBER	Numbers Who Returned Questionnaire	Numbers Who Commented in Open-Ended Section	Percent
Principals	462	256	56%
Chairmen	286	187	66%
Certificated Staff	279	149	53%
Parents	193	140	73%
Community Representatives	87	63	73%
Classified Staff	67	38	57%
Students	22	13	59%
Total	1396	846	60%

A separate comment data sheet was prepared for each questionnaire on which the strengths, weaknesses and recommendations were summarized. The variables of enrollment, administrative area, level of school, dominant ethnic group, and the council role of the respondent were also identified in order that these factors could be related to comments. After all of the open-ended responses had been read, it was found that the resulting information could be systematized into approximately 45 categories of strengths, weaknesses and recommendations. Tally sheets were then prepared to reveal the frequencies of the comments within the categories. The sequence in which the responding groups are presented is not according to any hierarchy or status but, rather, according to the total number of responses received.

It will be evident that some of the same factors perceived by certain respondents as strengths will be identified as weaknesses by others. This is an obvious and predictable outcome when such a large quantity of information is summarized and identified in the form of major categories and particularly with the breadth and diversity of schools and the number of respondents involved.

RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS

Strengths (Principals)

Principals most frequently (36)* indicated that the COOPERATION among the members was the greatest strength of their advisory councils. The ability to achieve internal unity and a harmonious working relationship was frequently cited as responsible for the identification of goals and the accomplishment of objectives. Closely following was the HIGH INTEREST level

---

*Numbers in parentheses indicate frequency

and enthusiasm of the members reported by the principals (27). Among other strengths voluntarily identified by principals were:

1. DEMOCRATIC REPRESENTATION of membership (14)
2. Ability to ACHIEVE GOALS (13)
3. Effective school-community COMMUNICATIONS (13)
4. Capability of the council CHAIRMEN (10)
5. Assistance and support of the existing PTA (9)
6. Excellent ATTENDANCE at meetings (9)
7. Complete INVOLVEMENT in school problems by members (8)

Other strengths were mentioned but with less significant frequency.

Weaknesses (Principals)

Principals most frequently expressed frustration over community APATHY (40) toward involvement in advisory councils. This concern was noticeable early in the questionnaire as problems related to recruiting members and chairmen were expressed in the "other" categories. Paradoxically, it was community INTEREST which was cited as the second most important strength by principals. Unskilled and untrained CHAIRMEN were the second most common concern of principals (20)--a precursory indication of a need for in-service training. Other weaknesses eliciting considerable comment were:

1. Reluctance of members to become totally INVOLVED (19)
2. The inadequacy of the HANDBOOK for school-community advisory councils (17)
3. INEXPERIENCED members (17)
4. Poor ATTENDANCE by the community at meetings (14)
5. Lack of clear-cut ROLE definitions (12) of members
6. COMMUNICATIONS gaps between central offices, schools and councils (11)

7. UNAVAILABILITY OF FUNDS (10)

8. Fragmentation of councils by internal special interest CLIQUES (10)

Among the other areas of lesser concern were: poorly planned agendas (9), undemocratic representation of the community (8), competitive rivalry by the PTA (7), irrelevancy of problems (7) and the inability of the group to identify goals (5).

Recommendations (Principals)

The greatest number of voluntary comments were presented as recommendations and it was the need for staff and community development in which there was unmistakable agreement among principals (121). Leading the list was the recommendation for IN-SERVICE TRAINING for all members (71), followed by such training for chairmen (50). When one considers that these recommendations resulted from a completely unstructured solicitation of open-ended responses, concern shared in this area is striking. Lagging behind, but frequently mentioned suggestions included:

1. Revision of the HANDBOOK for school-community advisory councils (14)
2. Stressing the ADVISORY function of the school-community advisory councils (12)
3. Providing FUNDS for operating expenses (12)
4. Identifying council GOALS (12)
5. Controlling divisive FACTIONS (12)
6. Encouraging non-member parent PARTICIPATION (11)
7. Securing more DEMOCRATIC representation (11)

Otner recommendations which emerged with less frequency included a need for more planning time for meetings (8), more effective publicity (8) and a clearer delineation of PTA and advisory council functions (6).

The strengths, weaknesses and recommendations of the ensuing groups,

in many instances, parallel those already enumerated. An effort will be made to avoid duplicative comments and to emphasize only those areas which are significant by contrast.

RESPONSES OF CHAIRMEN

Strengths (Chairmen)

Chairmen agreed with principals in their choice of COOPERATION (31) as the greatest strength of their advisory councils. With the exception of effective COMMUNICATIONS (15) which chairmen listed as their second greatest strength, there was substantial agreement with the principals in other areas of strength: identification of GOALS (14), community INTEREST (11), wide community INVOLVEMENT (10) and achievement of GOALS (10) were most frequently mentioned as strengths. Others included strong principals (9), efficient council organization (8) and effective community relations program (5).

Weaknesses (Chairmen)

Chairmen agreed with principals that APATHY (26), or lack of community interest, was the most serious weakness of councils. An absence of a desire for INVOLVEMENT (25), insufficient FUNDS (20), uncooperative PRINCIPALS (20), and the INEXPERIENCE (19) of members were frequently cited as problem areas. Other weaknesses revolved around COMMUNICATIONS (17), inefficient ORGANIZATION (15), IRRELEVANCY of problems (10), confusion over GOALS (9) and UNDEMOCRATIC PROCEDURES (9).

Recommendations (Chairmen)

The allocation of operating FUNDS (37) was the most widely endorsed recommendation by chairmen. IN-SERVICE TRAINING (34) persisted as an area of high priority, followed by a need for more responsibility (23), greater sharing of authority by the PRINCIPALS (18), methods of INVOLVING more

parents (15), and the more precise identification of council GOALS (15).

Other recommendations commonly fell into the following categories: encouraging better publicity (12), promoting community support (11), closer contact with the Board (11), and revision of the handbook for school-community advisory councils (10).

RESPONSES OF CERTIFICATED STAFF

Strengths (Certificated Staff)

The certificated staff concurred, for the most part, with the principals and chairmen in identifying areas of strength. COOPERATION (41) of the group was again most often mentioned as a council strength. Effective COMMUNICATION (28), the achievement of GOALS (15), high community INTEREST (14) and strong CHAIRMEN (13) received laudatory comments. Positive comments were also submitted in support of the effective leadership of PRINCIPALS (12), the RELEVANCY (10) of the problems considered, the extent of INVOLVEMENT (8) and the excellent ATTENDANCE (7) of members.

Weaknesses (Certificated Staff)

Community APATHY (33) was also identified as the most critical problem by certificated staff followed by the INEXPERIENCE (25) of council members, poorly organized AGENDAS (15), IRRELEVANCY (14) of problems and the lack of leadership skills of CHAIRMEN (12). Other identified weaknesses included lack of cooperation within the group (11), unsatisfactory communications (10), lack of cooperation or understanding by principals (9) and an inadequate handbook (8).

Recommendations (Certificated Staff)

The most frequent recommendations from this group were to develop more specific council GOALS (27), to encourage NON-MEMBER participation (22), to revise the school-community advisory council HANDBOOK (23), to

provide IN-SERVICE TRAINING (18) for members and to promote wider council REPRESENTATION (15). Other suggestions were related to emphasizing the need for well-organized agendas, securing adequate operational funds, encouraging more effective publicity and stressing bilingualism as essential in all council communications.

RESPONSES OF PARENTS

Strengths (Parents)

Responses from 140 parents to the open-ended questions did not fluctuate radically from those of groups already discussed. COOPERATION (23) again ranked first as a strength. Parents endorsed COMMUNICATIONS (22), the identification of GOALS (15), the leadership of the PRINCIPALS (10), the realization of established GOALS (10) and wide REPRESENTATION (10) of all groups on the councils. Less frequently identified strengths included: increased knowledge about the school program (9), relevancy of problems (9), skill of the council chairmen (8) and well-organized agendas (8).

Weaknesses (Parents)

Concurring with preceding groups, the overwhelming concern of parents was the APATHY (28) of the community toward advisory councils. In all other areas, concerns over specific weaknesses were more evenly distributed: uncooperative or uninterested PRINCIPALS (14), unidentified GOALS (13), unorganized AGENDAS (9), inadequate COMMUNICATIONS (9) and INEXPERIENCE OF MEMBERS (9).

Recommendations (Parents)

Parents were most concerned with a need for direction in identifying their GOALS (21) (functions) as an advisory council--despite the explicitness in this area in the Board guidelines and in the advisory council

handbook. Comments revealed confusion relating to the difference between roles of individual members and goals of the council. Recommendations included needs for more precise delineations of functions in the council guidelines.

Methods for dealing with community APATHY followed closely as a recommendation. The need for more RESPONSIBILITY (16), for operational FUNDS (15), for IN-SERVICE TRAINING for members (14), for an improved HANDBOOK (13), and for more effective PUBLICITY (12) were mentioned frequently. Wider representation (8), closer contact with the Board (6) and more opportunity to influence curriculum (5) were also cited.

RESPONSES OF COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES

Strengths (Community Representatives)

Although the total respondents (87) in the community representatives category was considerably smaller than in the groups previously considered, their identification of strengths coincided rather closely with those previously enumerated. COOPERATION (12) among members in working to achieve council goals was followed by community INTEREST (6), achievement of GOALS (4), effective COMMUNICATIONS (4) and depth of INVOLVEMENT (4).

Weaknesses (Community Representatives)

Again, APATHY (10) was most frequently identified as a weakness, followed by disorganized AGENDAS (9), ineffective leadership from PRINCIPALS (8) and lack of COOPERATION (5) within the membership group.

Recommendations (Community Representatives)

The need for means to encourage participation by NON-MEMBERS (14) was endorsed most often by community representatives. The need for FUNDS (11) and for more effective PUBLICITY (10) were followed by an evenly scattered

distribution among the remaining twenty areas.

RESPONSES OF CLASSIFIED STAFF

The weaknesses, strengths and recommendations contributed by the 38 classified staff members who volunteered information in the open-ended responses paralleled those of the certificated staff so closely that a separate consideration or enumeration of them would be redundant.

RESPONSES OF STUDENTS

Only 13 of the 22 students who responded to the survey included comments in the open-ended areas. These comments were evenly distributed in the categories of strengths and weaknesses.

Among the recommendations were: more DEMOCRATIC (5) representation, revision of the HANDBOOK (3), a need for more TIME (3) for meetings, and a desire for giving councils greater RESPONSIBILITY (3) in order to implement recommendations.

CONCLUSIONS

The parallels in all areas of the unstructured open-ended response section were striking when one considers the heterogeneity of the seven categories of respondents. Had such agreement been predictable, the following summary of strengths, weaknesses and recommendations might have been sufficiently comprehensive in itself. The summary, therefore, is representative of district-wide opinion of staff and community members.

TABLE 2-III Overall Summary of Open-Ended Responses on Survey Questionnaire

Rank	STRENGTHS IDENTIFIED: Response	Frequency
1	Cooperation within group	114
2	Communications	84
3	Interest of community	64
4	Goals identified	51
5	Goals achieved	50
6	Desire for involvement	39
7	Principal	36
8	Chairman	31
9	Good attendance	20
10	Representativeness	18
11	PTA assistance	17
12	Agenda well planned	16
13	Relevancy of problems	15
14	Publicity	10
15	Organization	8

Rank	WEAKNESSES IDENTIFIED: Response	Frequency
1	Apathy of community	143
2	Inexperience of members	80
3	Opposition to involvement	61
4	Principal	54
5	Agenda not organized	45
6	Problems not relevant	43
7	Chairman	41
8	Goals not identified	38
9	Handbook	36
10	Inadequate funds	33
11	Not representative	24
12	Goals not achieved	21
13	PTA conflict	19
14	Not democratic	17
15	Publicity	15

Rank	RECOMMENDATIONS:	Frequency
1	In-Service Training for members	150
2	Provide sufficient funds for operation	93
3	Identify goals for councils	84
4	Develop more effective publicity	68
5	Revise the handbook	67
6	Wider community representation	57
7	Provide methods for combating apathy	56
8	In-Service Training for chairmen	55
9	Instruct councils in developing agendas	35
10	Principals must relinquish more power	31
11	Emphasize idea that councils are advisory	30
12	Abolish councils	28
13	Recommend that more time be given to meetings	25
14	Develop closer contact with the Board	22
15	Decrease the time required for participation	18

SHORT-FORM QUESTIONNAIRE

OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES

The same procedures were used in analyzing the open-ended responses in the short-form questionnaire as were used in the longer survey. Again, respondents were asked to comment on one or both of the following statements:

A. Please state reasons why you believe your advisory council has been effective or ineffective this year.

B. Please make suggestions which you believe will improve your school-community advisory council.

Over 88% of the 1,126 respondents contributed comments which were organized into the three broad areas of strengths, weaknesses and recommendations. This arrangement of the data made the information much more manageable and intelligible. The task involved reading each questionnaire, establishing frequency categories from the trends of the suggestions and finally attempting to sort the related comments into appropriate areas. The fact that the analysis reveals a high degree of similarity with the responses in the longer survey form, although somewhat predictable, indicates the common awareness of needs which prevail in regard to an "effective" school-community advisory council.

Factors Contributing to Council Effectiveness (Strengths)

The increased INTEREST (94)* in direct involvement in educational decision-making was most frequently cited as contributing to advisory council effectiveness. A sharpened awareness that the solution to

---

*Numbers in parentheses indicate frequency

school problems must be a responsibility shared by the staff and the community has stimulated the need not only for the organization of advisory councils, but for the information and understanding necessary for effective participation in accomplishing the goals which are established by local councils. Respondents reinforce this statement by frequently relating council effectiveness to areas of in-service training and to the experience, or lack of it, possessed by the council members.

Strong leadership from cooperative PRINCIPALS (42), followed closely by skilled council CHAIRMEN (39) were often closely linked with council success.

The actual success experienced by councils in the IMPLEMENTATION (23) of their suggestions for improvement, quite naturally, stimulated enthusiasm for expanding their goals. Effective school-community-district office COMMUNICATION (21) was considered essential to insure strong councils. Members' AWARENESS (13) of student problems made councils effective in coping with solutions. Other positive factors cited as basic to success were: good ATTENDANCE (13) of council meetings by members, efficient ORGANIZATION (11), and the ease with which parents could VOICE CONCERNS (10) at meetings.

Factors Responsible for Council Ineffectiveness (Weaknesses)

The importance which should be attached to the selection and training of council CHAIRMEN (71) is substantiated by its assignment to the first rank among factors responsible for council ineffectiveness. Comments have already revealed that the use of such random selection methods as "drawing the name from a hat" are not likely to produce the most able leadership for the group--nor do they inspire within the individual the confidence associated with group endorsement. With a viable program of in-service training,

leadership for the group might still be salvageable regardless of an unskilled and inexperienced chairman. Without such a program, the prognosis for council effectiveness is, indeed, bleak.

Community APATHY (60), which was mentioned with disturbing regularity as a weakness in the open-ended SURVEY, received the second highest response frequency in this questionnaire also. The need for training in how to cope with the problem of local indifference was often expressed and should, most certainly, occupy a position of high concern in the development of an in-service training program. Poor ATTENDANCE (33) of non-members at council meetings, a product of apathy, was mentioned so often that it was put in a category separate from apathy. Commonly, the number of council members attending scheduled meetings far exceeds that of the non-members. Council member respondents interpreted this as community indifference--a judgment, perhaps, which is harsh. Ineffective publicity and unrealistic expectations of interest by the members might be more accurate explanations.

Although one might expect council members to perceive ineffective PRINCIPALS (29) as responsible for the ills of the councils, it is interesting to note that they became scapegoats with less than half the frequency of the chairmen.

Other factors identified as contributing to ineffectiveness were: lack of definition of council ROLE (14), the amount of TIME (9) consumed by the organization process, inadequate AGENDAS (8) which permitted meetings to degenerate to unproductive "rap sessions," the domination of councils by DIVISIVE (7) factions and the lack of sufficient AUTHORITY (7) to solve serious problems.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The need to know how to cope with community APATHY (154) toward advisory councils and to encourage greater community involvement again confirms the high priority which should be assigned to this concern of both staff and community. Receiving wide support was the expressed general need for IN-SERVICE TRAINING (90) for all members.

Methods for improving PUBLICITY (78) and the need for operational FUNDS (46) were, not unexpectedly, in prominent positions among the recommendations.

Skill in organizing and following AGENDAS (41) at meetings is an apparent need which, again, is allied with the need for training in developing council leadership.

The need to revise the Handbook for School-Community Advisory Councils and Board GUIDELINES (27) coupled with the desire for more INFORMATION (23) about how the schools operate were closely related.

Other recommendations which received significant measures of support were: principals must permit staff and community to SHARE (14) in the decision-making process, COMMUNICATIONS (14) between the school and its community should be improved, meetings should start and end on TIME (12) and more attention should be directed toward a BILINGUAL (12) approach in council proceedings.

SUMMARY

Despite the quantity of responses and the breadth and diversity of backgrounds represented by the respondents, it is relatively simple to establish the major priorities which emerged as identified strengths, weaknesses and recommendations from the open-ended responses on both questionnaires.

There is little doubt that the most recognizable need is for in-service training. Stated differently, however, this objective can include many other elements which simply express the need to insure that the school and the community accept a shared responsibility in solving our educational problems. Those elements include meaningful involvement, mutual cooperation, good communication and increased, effective participation. A sincere principal and a skilled chairman can provide the framework for these objectives. In-service training is simply the tool to make these outcomes a reality.

FACTORS RELATED TO COUNCIL EFFECTIVENESS

BACKGROUND

Despite the enormous collection and systematization of data represented by this survey, efforts to enumerate and assess individual or multiple factors related to council effectiveness are, to an extent, speculative. Since even a precise definition of council "effectiveness" invites debate, the degree to which individual components affect council adequacy is difficult to measure. Although they may only be partially substantiated by statistical data, the inclusion of those factors closely related to effectiveness is essential in fulfilling the objectives of this study. It is important, therefore, to look at the three categories of council organization, structure and operation in an attempt to delineate "council effectiveness."

ORGANIZATION AND EFFECTIVENESS

The measure of organizational guidance provided to a council through vehicles such as the guidelines to Board Rule 1370 and the handbook is unquestionably related to its ultimate effectiveness. The degree of explicitness necessary in this area is modified by one's perception of the council itself. Democratic procedures in the selection of members and chairmen, the assignment of a high priority to ethnic-racial representativeness, and a concern for a wide dissemination of information about organizational procedures reinforce community confidence in the integrity of council organization.

There are sufficient indications, reinforced by the open-ended responses, that despite the late printing and defined weaknesses in the handbook, councils which bypassed organizational procedures advocated in the handbook

often encountered problems which impaired their functional effectiveness. Those councils which patterned their organization after models suggested in the handbook seemed to spend less time overcoming such difficulties.

A number of facts which emerged from the survey point to a high degree of effectiveness in regard to the organizational process.

1. Almost eighty percent of council members were well informed about Board Rule 1370.
2. Sixty percent of the council members found the handbook helpful in establishing or reorganizing their school council.
3. More than eighty-two percent were elected as members of advisory councils.
4. Eighty-four percent of all advisory council members were satisfied with the membership selection procedures (36% highly satisfied, 48% satisified).

The evidences of ineffectiveness in terms of council organization were revealed by:

1. Two hundred and two councils where fewer than 25 people turned out to participate in the planning meeting.
2. One hundred ninety-one councils which were formed before the handbook was printed and made available.
3. Almost fifty percent of the council members who described the turnout for the election as "adequate" and another twenty-five percent who described that participation as "very little."

Such facts would seem to indicate that the full spectrum of success and failure prevailed as elementary and secondary school-communities dealt with the organizational problems of forming a new council or reorganizing an old one. Nonetheless, the fact that only slightly more than a fifth of

the members adjudged their councils "not effective" in an overall evaluation is compatible with the high levels of satisfaction expressed with general organizational procedures.

STRUCTURE AND EFFECTIVENESS

"Council structure" refers to the composition of councils in terms of the representativeness of members and also to the method used for their selection.

Obviously, such factors as ratios of members in terms of ethnic background, sex, and representative roles as well as the method used for their selection, are closely related to council effectiveness.

It is almost inconceivable that a grossly unrepresentative council could be judged even moderately effective. Likewise, a council selected by undemocratic procedures would be so weakened by a lack of community support that even a modicum of success would be most unlikely.

Although improper council structure has the potential for limiting council effectiveness, the data gathered did not indicate that this had occurred. The area in which there is greatest control by the rather flexible Board guidelines is that of the proportions of members in relation to their roles. Existing councils were requested to elect or appoint a minimum of three additional members of school support groups, and to provide for faculty and student (secondary level) representation. Based on the information in the open-ended response questions it is interesting that, within this more structured framework, there appeared to be little conflict--a fact, perhaps, which endorses the need for directive guidelines.

A less serious, but more prevalent form of under-representation is that of men--particularly evident on the elementary level. Councils should explore every avenue possible to correct this deficiency.

It seemed most logical that if dissatisfaction were to be expressed in regard to council structure it would occur in regard to the ethnic/racial composition of councils. In general this was not the case, although it is obvious that every effort should be made to completely eliminate this problem in council organization.

Table 1-IV In your opinion is your council representative of the ethnic/racial composition of the student body of your school?

COUNCIL MEMBERS	EXTENT OF REPRESENTATIVENESS			
	Highly Representative	Somewhat Representative	Not Representative	No Opinion
Chairmen	141 53.2%	91 34.3%	27 10.2%	6 2.3%
Parents	71 42.5%	59 35.3%	26 15.6%	11 6.6%
Community Represent-atives	36 53.7%	25 37.3%	4 6.0%	2 3.0%
Students	9 47.4%	3 15.8%	7 36.8%	0 0.0%
Principals	265 58.0%	158 34.6%	33 7.2%	1 .2%
Certificated School Staff	124 53.4%	84 36.2%	20 8.6%	4 1.8%
Classified School Staff	31 60.8%	13 25.5%	6 11.7%	1 2.0%
All Members	677 53.8%	433 34.4%	123 9.8%	25 2.0%

Schools with relatively homogeneous student populations normally would be expected to have representative advisory council membership. It was important, therefore, to consider whether advisory council members in schools with a heterogeneous student population felt that their advisory council was representative. A number of schools with heterogeneous student bodies were selected and evaluated in regard to that question. It is significant that only ten percent of these respondents considered their schools "not representative" (Table 2-IV) and that the district-wide response in the same category was 9.8%.

Table 2-IV In your opinion is your council representative of the ethnic/racial composition of the student body of your school?

	Highly Representative	Somewhat Representative	Not Representative	No Opinion
ALL MEMBERS (HETEROGENEOUS SCHOOLS)	140 46.0%	132 43.0%	31 10.0%	4 1.0%

It seems logical to conclude that although a serious problem of unrepresentativeness has the potential for destroying council effectiveness, the small level of dissatisfaction expressed by respondents indicated that sufficient awareness does prevail in regard to the need for a representative council structure. Councils, in general, appear to recognize the importance of reflecting the composition of their community structure and that secondly, departures from democratic procedures in council member selection procedures introduce community alienation. Certainly those who find that their councils deviate seriously from the prevailing structural patterns should feel an urgency for a reappraisal of their designs.

OPERATION AND EFFECTIVENESS

Certain specific data, such as the number of members and non-members who attend council meetings, the existence of bylaws, and reactions about frequency and times of meetings, provide important information about operational effectiveness of councils. In addition, the subjective evaluation related to the extent of involvement and degree of cooperation of members in designated council functions offer an even broader base for judgments about effectiveness.

Evidences of effectiveness certainly are indicated by the fact that:

1. Eighty-six percent of the respondents considered that the frequency of council meetings was "about right."

2. Seventy-five percent of the councils have between 11 and 25 members present at their meetings (suggested by the handbook as the desirable size).
3. A very sizable majority (86%) are satisfied with the procedures used to conduct council meetings.

Effectiveness seemed less related to the frequency of meetings than to planned agendas. Monthly meetings, complemented by subcommittee meetings as needed, seemed sufficient in most cases. In situations of confusion resulting from vague agendas or other evidences of unskilled leadership, even weekly meetings would have been inadequate.

In addition, delays in adopting operating procedures contributed to member frustration. Interest lagged when members found themselves not even remotely involved in advisory roles but, in session after session, embroiled in the effort of developing bylaws and rules of operation. Some councils, reportedly, never completed this task. By contrast, councils that followed procedures outlined in the handbook should have been able to undertake more meaningful responsibilities.

Council effectiveness also is predicated on the opportunity for extensive non-member participation in the program. Since virtually all councils indicate that provision has been made for non-member participation, it would be difficult to link this variable with ineffectiveness--except, of course, for the small number of councils reporting the absence of such an opportunity. On the other hand, whether the inability of advisory council meetings to attract non-members is attributable to apathy or to ineffective publicity, the fact that three-fourths of the councils report an average non-member attendance of fewer than ten should concern all who are trying to broaden community involvement.

Involvement of Council Members

In order to assess the amount of involvement of advisory councils in fulfilling their eight functions as enumerated in Board Rule 1370, each of the separate functions was listed in the Survey Questionnaire and respondents were asked to check appropriate categories of involvement and effectiveness. In no way is this technique represented as a true measure of either involvement or effectiveness; the assessment of these factors is as imperfect as the objectivity of the raters.

Involvement, perhaps, may be less subject to the biases of the respondents, but one must be skeptical of "effectiveness" ratings based on judgmental perceptions submitted by the evaluators on behalf of themselves. It is quite probable that agreement in negative areas may be accurate--that is, a council judged "not effective" by most of its members is likely to be ineffective. It does not necessarily follow, however, that members of the council who label themselves "effective" are actually effective. Additionally, one must consider that almost half of the respondents chose "too early to evaluate" in declining to rate "effectiveness." Aware of these limitations, it was still considered important to analyze the relationship between involvement and effectiveness. Predictably these two factors do have a relatively high degree of correlation.

In order to demonstrate this relationship, medians were computed for each advisory council function using a scale of 0 - 3 for amount of involvement and a scale of 0 - 1 for amount of effectiveness. Based on these medians a rank order was established for each of the defined functions. Statistically the relationship is reflected to the extent that the assigned involvement and effectiveness "ranks" correspond. In Table 3-IV these relationships are illustrated most readily in functions a, d, f, and k. (Figures in parenthesis represent rank order.)

Table 3-IV Median Ratings of Amount of Involvement and Effectiveness*

HAS YOUR ADVISORY COUNCIL:	3 = Much, 2 = Some 1 = Little, 0 = None MEDIAN INVOLVEMENT RATING	1 = Effective 0 = Not Effective MEDIAN EFFECTIVENESS RATING
a. Participated in the identification of educational needs?	2.11 (1)	.79 (1)
b. Advised on the resource needs of schools (e.g., staff, materials, and funds)?	2.00 (2)	.69 (7)
c. Made recommendations regarding the planning, development or improvement of school educational programs? (i.e., curriculum recommendations)	1.87 (4)	.72 (5.5)
d. Made budgetary recommendations to meet educational program needs?	.84 (10)	.30 (10)
e. Participated in the definition of educational goals, objectives and priorities?	1.72 (7)	.73 (4)
f. Advised on the use of specific indicators that would show proggress toward educational objectives (e.g., standardized tests, parent surveys)?	1.14 (9)	.34 (9)
g. Oriented and advised school staff regarding conditions in the community (e.g., vandalism, drug abuse)?	1.70 (8)	.72 (5.5)
h. Participated in the development of policies affecting the interests and welfare of pupils (e.g., discipline, homework, grading practices, etc.)?	1.81 (6)	.78 (2)
i. Facilitated school communication with parents and citizens? (i.e., school community relations)	1.94 (3)	.61 (8)
j. Assisted in securing the support and services of parents, teachers, and students? (i.e., mobilized public support for the school)	1.83 (5)	.74 (3)
k. Participated in the evaluation of the school and its academic effectiveness and made recommendations to the superintendent for improvement? (e.g., on reading achievement level)	.74 (11)	.25 (11)
All Functions	1.68	.67

*The eight functions in the handbook were delineated as eleven categories for survey purposes.

Cooperation Among Council Members

In order to assess the levels of cooperation among council members, all respondents were asked to rate on a scale of 4 (1 = excellent, 2 = good, 3 = average, and 4 = poor) the level of cooperation they perceived to exist between each type of council member. Table 4-IV reveals that in almost all instances, levels of cooperation among council members ranged from good to excellent; in no case was the rating as low as average. Reinforcing this evidence of the relative absence of friction among members is the fact that internal cooperation was ranked number one by respondents among identifiable strengths of councils on the open-ended questions in the survey.

Table 4-IV Amount of Cooperation Among Council Members*

As Indicated by:	Principals	Chairmen	Parents	Community Representatives	Certificated Staff	Classified Staff	Students
Principals		1.20	1.32	1.30	1.22	1.14	1.27
Chairmen	1.19		1.41	1.36	1.31	1.43	1.48
Parents	1.55	1.62		1.77	1.73	1.84	1.76
Community Representatives	1.48	1.57	1.87		1.92	1.92	2.23
Certificated Staff	1.32	1.59	1.72	1.83		1.50	1.68
Classified Staff	1.23	1.37	1.45	1.40	1.33		1.27
Students	1.47	2.00	2.45	2.20	1.40	1.44	

*Numbers indicate median ratings

The relative importance of member categories to council effectiveness merits continued consideration--although a statistical analysis of this variable is complex. Certainly the "people process" is a decisive component in council effectiveness--and, although the role of the principal is that of an "ex-officio non-voting member," no one is more responsible for the ultimate success or failure of the council.

A role of passive cooperation, as might be implied by the description of the principal's role in the guidelines, is probably inadequate to ensure effectiveness. It must be one of cooperation and reserved leadership. If the principal is reluctant to permit his advisory council to exercise their advisory role in the decision-making process, members soon develop an attitude of frustration and powerlessness. The principal may be regarded as an autocrat if he communicates his perception of the advisory council as an intruder into the area of decision-making. Such a climate precludes the possibility for effectiveness.

If, on the other hand, the principal is one who can exercise leadership without dogmatism, who can influence the direction of council goals without becoming directive, who can provide informal assistance for members who need it without domination, and who can participate in a partnership in mobilizing community involvement, then effectiveness is almost certain, even though optimum conditions in terms of the council structure may not prevail.

Complaints that members lack the skill or knowledge to make an advisory council work are frequently cited as causes for ineffectiveness. Certainly, an unskilled chairman is a handicap to a council--as are any other representatives whose inexperience makes them unable to cope with the problems they are asked to solve.

The need for a formal program of in-service training is reiterated in many areas of the questionnaires. However, until such a program is in operation, it would appear that the responsibility for helping members develop the necessary skills to perform effectively in their council roles should be assumed by the principal and appropriate staff.

In short, no serious problem exists in the desire among the majority of members to work together harmoniously--indeed, this is an unmistakable

strength--but effectiveness varies to a considerable extent with the degree of member aptitude, training and experience to achieve this goal.

Length of Experience

Another factor which appeared most necessary to consider in evaluating council effectiveness was that related to the length of time a school had had some form of advisory council. Recognizing that many schools have had councils as the result of compensatory education programs or administrative direction, it seemed reasonable to assume that this experience would produce positive values and a higher degree of operational success.

In analyzing this variable, however, it was important to realize that even previously existing councils were not operating under the same design or with the same guidelines as that mandated by Board Rule 1370.

It also would be true that the existence of an advisory council for a period of time prior to Board Rule 1370 did not imply that individual council members possessed a comparable degree, amount or breadth of experience in community participation.

Nonetheless, it seemed desirable to attempt to evaluate "effectiveness" in relation to two components; namely, the extent of time a school had some form of advisory council and the specific educational functions defined by Board Rule 1370.

Medians were again computed for each advisory council function using a scale range from 0 for "not effective" to 1 for "effective." Table 5-IV reflects the median scale value for each function, based on length of advisory council experience and also indicates the number and percentage of respondents who considered it "too early" to evaluate effectiveness.

Table 5-IV Effectiveness of District Advisory Councils That Have Had Some Form of Advisory Council*

FUNCTIONS	AMOUNT OF TIME THAT SCHOOL HAD SOME FORM OF ADVISORY COUNCIL BEFORE THE ADOPTION OF BOARD RULE 1370					
	None		Under Two Years		Two to Four Years	
	Degree of Effectiveness	Too Early	Degree of Effectiveness	Too Early	Degree of Effectiveness	Too Early
Participated in the identification of educational needs	.65	70%	.82	45%	.83	36%
Advised on the resource needs of schools	.81	48%	.71	43%	.77	34%
Made recommendations on the planning, development or improvement of school programs	.40	73%	.67	46%	.80	36%
Made budgetary recommendations to meet educational program needs	.05	73%	.31	50%	.48	39%
Participated in the definition of goals, objectives and priorities	.58	66%	.72	43%	.80	39%
Advised on the use of indicators that show progress toward educational objectives	.23	72%	.38	49%	.40	50%
Oriented and advised school staff on conditions in the community	.66	56%	.73	32%	.75	31%
Participated in the development of policies affecting the interests and welfare of pupils	.68	62%	.77	35%	.84	26%
Facilitated school communication with parents and citizens	.73	51%	.78	31%	.84	23%
Assisted in securing the support of parents, teachers and students	.67	55%	.74	33%	.83	27%
Participated in the evaluation of the school and made recommendations to the superintendent	.19	66%	.25	50%	.31	45%
All Functions	.57	62%	.67	42%	.74	35%

*The eight functions in the handbook were delineated as eleven categories for survey purposes.

It is significant to note the tendency for increased effectiveness to be reflected as council experience increases. Also significant is the "too early" column. Although this is less in every instance with increased time of council operation, it nonetheless, is an indication that time is a very important item to be considered when evaluating council effectiveness.

SUMMARY

Primarily because this analysis represents the first effort to determine council effectiveness, it seems improbable that valid conclusions can be drawn at such an early point in time. Subsequent evaluations, based on additional data and a longer opportunity for school and community members to evolve more clearly defined working relationships, should provide considerably more substantial evidence of the criteria necessary for defining operational effectiveness.

Certainly there is a clear indication that council representation is an important element in this process. That representation must not only seek to reflect staff and community composition, but also should be similar to the ethnic and racial make-up of the student body. If possible, a balance in the number of men and women on the council should be sought. Add to this an effort to increase participation by non-council members and the base for effective operation can exist.

It appears even more important, however, if a council is to function effectively, that a careful analysis be given to ways in which council members can become involved in meaningful activities related to the school program. Extensive time spent on the development of bylaws, a constitution, or on parliamentary procedures will only cause frustration. Members who feel that their points of view are being considered, that their ideas may offer potential solutions to educational problems, not only will feel

involved, but will consider their role effective.

The goal is to achieve a pattern of cooperative, constructive relationships based on mutual confidence. This can and will be achieved when each council member has the experience to perceive his role accurately, to understand the legal and financial limitations which prevail at the school level and to operate within the framework of that structure to improve the educational program.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Any evaluation of this type, by its very nature, can be presented only as a composite analysis of the findings received. The data in this survey reflect the totality of information about advisory councils in the Los Angeles Unified School District. Admittedly, the evidences of problems, frustration, or even failure of individual councils appear as generalized statistics or observations. However, it is equally true that effectiveness, cooperation and operational success blend into the same pattern. The outcome, therefore, represents a normative description of the 560 advisory councils in all of our elementary and secondary schools.

A singular benefit of such an evaluation effort certainly should be that members of an advisory council can use this report as a means of comparing their own council operation. In this way, procedures can be analyzed, roles can be compared and responsibilities can be judged on the basis of local school and community needs. The principal then, with the support and assistance of his advisory chairman, can better assume the responsibility for providing the climate in which the advisory council can function most effectively.

Not to be minimized in this process, is the role of the area superintendent. In this very critical area of community participation, it is essential that the superintendent become closely identified with the unique interpersonal, in-service and operational needs of each school in his area. It is at this level, therefore, that the link between district policy and local school function is reinforced.

A second very significant outcome of this initial advisory council survey effort is the value of the many opinions, suggestions and reactions

received from a broad cross-section of our staff and community members. Not only does this serve to emphasize the importance of points of view which reflect the scope and diversity of our total school district, but it also demonstrates the importance of a significant avenue of communication which now exists in the form of the advisory council structure. This implies, also, a responsibility which the district now has to reinforce and to develop a more effective contact with our school community.

Lastly, it seems apparent that this survey effort--or any survey effort--which is conceived with the objective of realistically examining the issues involved, will provide a data base which offers a significant source of direction and assistance for solving problems and improving operational procedures. The degree of involvement in this process extends far beyond the responses of 2,522 people to the two questionnaires. It includes all of the replies to the preliminary surveys, the committee work of designing the evaluation forms and, most importantly, the reactions of the many professional and community members who suggested important and essential changes in the design and scope of the survey questions.

Although perhaps not measurable, but certainly present in this evaluation outcome is the evidence of the tremendous scope and dynamics of the interpersonal relationships--the "people" process, if you will--which the 1971-72 school year brought into sharp focus with the "new" design for community involvement.

It is from this base that certain conclusions and recommendations have been made as a means of providing a foundation for future planning.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The overall evaluation of advisory councils in the Los Angeles Unified School District revealed that:

1. A high degree of correspondence does exist between the organization, structure and functions of councils and the general patterns proposed in the guidelines of Board Rule 1370.
2. The use of democratic procedures in the organization and operation of advisory councils is endorsed by a large majority of the council members in the district.
3. A well-conceived, comprehensive and coordinated in-service training program for all council members is a crucial need--with primary focus on the roles of the chairman and the principal.
4. Cooperation among members is a conspicuous strength of councils and must be a primary emphasis if council effectiveness is to be increased.
5. Community apathy is viewed as the most significant obstacle to council effectiveness.
6. Councils are considered by the majority of members to be generally representative of their school-communities, but an intensified effort is necessary to increase non-member participation.
7. The role of the principal is closely related to the success of the council, with the chairman representing an equally important element in this effort.
8. The extent of involvement of members appears to be satisfactory but evidence indicates the need to provide for realistic participation by <u>all</u> council members.
9. Members generally assess their councils as moderately effective

in the functional areas enumerated in the guidelines.

10. Operational success appears to increase markedly as councils and council members gain experience.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Definition of "Advisory"

Based on the open-ended responses, and reinforced by the twelve community meetings held during the decentralization evaluation, it is evident that considerable ambiguity results from conflicting interpretations of "advisory" as it relates to educational decision-making. The principal's responsibility for administrative decisions is clearly defined. If he is apprehensive about the future effects of his council's recommendations, he may, quite understandably, veto such proposals. Such rejections, however, may arouse animosity among council members and they may charge that the principal is reluctant to allow the council to assume its proper role.

The avoidance of such an impasse involves consummate human relations skills on the part of the principal coupled with a measure of understanding and sophistication on the part of the council. Neither all principals nor all councils possess these virtues. Therefore, it would seem practical to give a more explicit delineation of limitations imposed by "advisory," particularly since there are long-term educational implications involved in the community participation process.

2. Revisions of Guidelines

Nothing in the survey evaluation negates the emphasis presented in the Decentralization Report for clearer, more concise, procedural and operational guidelines. Whether designed as a new Board rule, with

accompanying necessary administrative regulations or defined as basic policy statements, principals and council members in general, consistently express the need for more direction. The basic dilemma in this process is the critical judgment of how to provide for local autonomy and flexibility and still offer district-wide rules which establish an equitable and consistent format for advisory council operation. There is considerable evidence to support the point of view that more, not fewer, district guidelines will increase the possibility of council success.

3. Restatement of Functions

Unfortunately, we have created a problem for council members by the manner in which council functions (activities) have been identified in the guidelines. The broad, general terminology poses serious problems in the average advisory council situation. If council members are to become more involved and feel that the results of their efforts are worthwhile, there is a critical need to redefine the council functions (activities) for council participation in terms which are meaningful, practical and realistic to the layman. By establishing more specific objectives for advisory council members, increased participation may result and a greater turnout of non-council members, which now is conspicuously low, may be encouraged.

4. Seek to Solve Problem of "Apathy"

District-wide, council members in general have expressed concerns about lack of participation and "community apathy." There is no denying the significance of this problem and particularly as it applies to the non-council member category. There are no easy answers to this situation but certainly every effort must be made to increase participation at all of our schools if the advisory council concept is to succeed.

It must be recognized that large numbers of parents and community members would not normally be expected to become actively involved in school activities in the usual sequence of events. Large turnouts for a school meeting would most often be expected only when a "crisis" situation prevails.

On the other hand, an intensive effort must be made at the local school level if there is difficulty in assembling a moderate-sized advisory council. Such a council becomes a source of contact with the larger school community and an effective way to reach many additional parents.

The elements in this process are varied and complex but they certainly must include an atmosphere of cooperation, an opportunity for meaningful involvement and the potential for effective, productive outcomes. Parents and community members who feel a sense of accomplishment as a result of their efforts will be more likely to participate. An effective in-service program may provide much to help solve this problem. Successes of neighboring schools can serve as a basis for operational comparisons. Lastly, this evaluation survey, hopefully, may provide some indication of the elements necessary to minimize, if not to overcome, community apathy.

5. Necessary Further Evaluation

It appears most clear that continuing evaluations of our advisory council operation must be made if more accurate delineations of "effectiveness" are to be determined. Although most schools had formed advisory councils before they became mandatory, the diversity in the organization and operation of pre-Board Rule 1370 councils made standards

for the evaluation of effectiveness difficult. This was substantiated by the high "too early to evaluate" effectiveness response, even from councils which had been organized for a period of time. Although many councils had been operating from four to five years, and many for at least two, they had not been provided with explicit guidelines of functions. Consequently, they had no common yardstick for the measurement of effectiveness until after June of 1971.

As a result, this evaluative effort must be regarded as premature in certain areas--particularly in the attempt to measure the degree of involvement and effectiveness of council members. The precise assessment of the relationships between significant, identifiable variables and effectiveness is a task which must be assigned to future evaluations.

SUMMARY

The potential of the advisory council for establishing school-community dialogue for shared participation in educational decision-making is unprecedented in our district. When one considers that all of our 560 regular elementary and secondary schools are now represented by a group actively involved in a school-community partnership, the uniqueness and scope of the program for effective cooperative and educational planning is clearly evident.

The school-community advisory council is the vehicle by which diverse points of view may be aired and their reconciliation shared; by which those who previously felt forgotten may become involved; by which futility and confrontation may be changed to shared cooperation and realistic expectations. It can and must be the way for the school image and the school program to be improved.

APPENDIX A
preliminary evaluation efforts

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

December 3, 1971

TO: William J. Johnston

FROM: _____

Superintendent, Area _____

SUBJECT: SCHOOL COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL

(REPORT DUE DECEMBER 14, 1971)

The following information is submitted as a status report as of December 14, 1971 concerning the implementation of Board Rule 1370 - Establishment and Operation of School Community Advisory Councils.

1. There are ____ elementary and secondary schools in Area ____.

2. As of December 1, 1971 ____ elementary and secondary schools have established a School Community Advisory Council in accord with Board Rule 1370.

3. The following schools have been unable at this date to establish a council in accord with the prescribed Board rule:

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

4. The attached documentation indicates the reasons why the schools listed above were not successful in complying with Board rule 1370 by December 1, 1971 and provides an estimate by the principal of the date when the council will be established.

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

LOS ANGELES CITY SCHOOLS

TO: Members of the Board of Education Date January 10, 1972

FROM: Dr. William Johnston

SUBJECT: SCHOOL COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCILS

On December 14, 1971, reports were submitted by the superintendents of the twelve administrative areas concerning the formation of School Community Advisory Councils in accordance with Board Rule 1370, adopted June 28, 1971.

Within the specified deadline date of December 1, 1971, 543 of the 566 elementary and secondary schools of the District had established councils under the prescribed Board rule. Of the 23 schools which were unable to meet the deadline date, 14 were able to comply by December 17, 1971.

I am pleased to present the following statistical information concerning the status of the formation of Advisory Councils as of January 7, 1972.

AREA	SCHOOLS	FORMED	NOT FORMED
A	62	60	2
B	52	52	0
C	48	48	0
D	45	45	0
E	44	44	0
F	35	35	0
G	43	43	0
H	47	47	0
I	43	43	0
J	45	45	0
K	46	42	4
L	56	56	0
TOTAL	566	560	6

FORM 34-AEH-3 1-69 (STK. NO. 815901)

The six schools where councils have not yet been formed will meet the mandate of the Board rule not later than January 28, 1972.

Between now and June 1, 1972, when a substantive evaluation of existing councils will be made, it is intended that additional reports will be prepared in order that you may be kept informed as to the progress and development of our School Community Advisory Councils.

Although the Board rule did not encompass adult schools, it is significant that 37 out of 40 schools in the Division of Adult Education (including Skill Centers and Occupational Centers) have formed Advisory Councils and the other three are in process. It also is important to note that the Division of Special Education has been extensively involved in a city-wide, regional and local community advisory organization since 1968. The four regional advisory structure has been the most effective design for the 19 special education schools since they serve pupils and parents from all sections of our District.

WJJ:an

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

TO: Area Superintendents DATE: January 24, 1972

FROM: Wilson Jordan

SUBJECT: EVALUATION OF ADVISORY COUNCILS

The Education and Management Assessment Office has been given the responsibility of evaluating advisory councils and making periodic reports to the Board of Education.

The first written report was related to the formation of Community Advisory Councils under Board Rule 1370 and was reported to the Board of Education on January 10, 1972.

The questionnaire for the second report should be distributed to principals between January 25 and February 4, 1972. Principals are requested to forward the completed questionnaires to the Area Superintendent's Office on or before February 21, 1972.

Area superintendents are asked to use the summary form to compile the results of the questionnaire from their individual schools. Area superintendents should forward the summary form only to the Education and Management Office on or before March 1. May we recommend that the individual forms from each school be kept on file for future reference.

Please contact this office if you have questions regarding this form (687-4820).

WKJ:an

January 24, 1972

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL - AREA SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT NO. 2

SUMMARY FORM

AREA_____ Total number of schools_____

I. Indicate the number of advisory councils in the following categories.

	No. of Schools
A. Schools that continued existing advisory councils	
B. Schools that continued existing advisory councils but members were added or deleted?	
C. Schools that continued existing advisory councils with major reorganization	
D. Schools with new advisory councils	
E. Schools that utilized their Title I Advisory Councils	

II. Indicate the number of advisory councils having:

A. All elected representatives	
B. Combinations of elected and appointed representatives	
1. Majority elected	
2. Majority appointed	

III. Indicate which of the following categories best describes the composition of each advisory council.

Parent, staff, *student	
Parent, staff, *student, resident	
Parent, staff, *student, resident business/professional	
Parent, staff, *student, resident, business/professional, organization	

IV. Indicate the size of advisory councils

Small (11 - 16 mmebers)	
Medium (17 - 24 members)	
Large (25 - 35 members)	

V. Indicate the community identification category that best describes the advisory council chairmen.

Parent _____

Staff _____

*Student _____

Resident _____

Business/Professional _____

Organization _____

Comments _____

_____

VI. Indicate the number of schools with elected chairmen _____

Comments _____

_____

VII. Indicate frequency of advisory council meetings.

Weekly _____

Bi-Weekly _____

Monthly _____

Bi-Monthly _____

Unscheduled, only as needed _____

Time: Day _____

Night _____

Area Superintendent _____

*Applies only to secondary schools

RETURN BY MARCH 1, 1972 to: Dr. Wilson Jordan
Education and Management Assessment Office
H-158, Administrative Offices

January 25, 1972

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

SCHOOL COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL - REPORT NO. 2

School _____ Area _____

I. STATUS OF COUNCIL

	Yes	No
A. Was the existing advisory council continued?	____	____
B. Was the existing advisory council continued but members added or deleted?	____	____
C. Was there a major reorganization of the existing advisory council?	____	____
D. Was a new advisory council formed?	____	____
E. Was the Title I Advisory Council continued as the school advisory council?	____	____

II. INDICATE THE NUMBER OF MEMBERS ON THE ADVISORY COUNCIL Appointed___ Elected___ Total___

III. INDICATE THE REPRESENTATION OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL

Community Identification		Number	Amer. Ind.	Black	Asian	Spanish Surname	Filipino and other minorities	White
Parent								
Staff	Certificated							
	Classified							
*Student								
Resident								
Business/Professional								
Organization								

IV. ADVISORY COUNCIL CHAIRMAN: Name _____

Address _____

Telephone Number _____

Community Identification _____

V. SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS: Frequency of meetings _____

Time of advisory council meetings _____

Principal's Signature _____

*Applies only to secondary schools

RETURN TO AREA SUPERINTENDENT ON OR BEFORE FEBRUARY 21, 1972.

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

LOS ANGELES CITY SCHOOLS

TO: Members of the Board of Education Date March 23, 1972

FROM: Dr. William Johnston

SUBJECT: COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL REPORT NO. 2

The following information represents the second in a series of progress reports on the organization and formation of community advisory councils under Board Rule 1370. Essentially this report provides some additional quantitative information about the status of the advisory councils in our twelve administrative areas.

Additional information will be provided for you in a third progress report by mid-April and a final evaluation report concerning the effectiveness of advisory councils is planned for the early part of June.

WKJ:an

Attachment

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

SCHOOL COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL REPORT #2

	Administrative Areas											
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
I. Total Number of Schools	62	56	47	45	44	37	43	47	43	44	52	50
II. Formation of Advisory Councils												
A. Schools that continued existing advisory councils	1	1	4	5	2	16	9	3	4	4	6	6
B. Schools that continued existing advisory councils but members were added or deleted	22	21	15	27	13	0	19	10	13	11	13	8
C. Schools that continued existing advisory councils with major reorganization	3	7	4	2	6	0	0	12	8	7	4	2
D. Schools with new advisory councils	36	12	7	11	20	21	15	17	18	22	27	34
E. Schools that utilized their Title I Advisory Councils	0	15	17	0	3	0	0	5	0	0	2	0
III. Elected and/or Appointed Membership												
A. All elected representatives	22	24	18	21	24	0	32	23	18	18	18	18
B. Majority elected	30	14	16	18	20	37	7	19	18	25	31	29
C. Majority appointed	10	18	11	4	0	0	2	5	7	1	3	3
D. Volunteers	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
IV. Composition That Best Describes Advisory Council												
A. Parent, staff, *student	62	20	25	22	15	8	18	17	21	17	27	22
B. Parent, staff, *student, resident	0	9	5	1	8	3	12	5	2	2	8	1
C. Parent, staff, *student, resident, business/professional	0	11	5	4	3	5	4	6	6	5	6	4
D. Parent, staff, *student, resident, business/professional, organization	0	16	12	18	18	21	9	19	14	20	11	23

*Applies only to secondary schools

	Administrative Areas											
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
V. Advisory Council Size												
A. Small (11-16 members)	35	20	11	20	18	13	10	22	26	28	26	21
B. Medium (17-24 members)	19	17	18	16	15	12	16	20	13	12	15	18
C. Large (25-35 members)	6	19	18	9	7	12	17	5	4	4	11	11
D. Under 11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
E. Over 35	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VI. Identification That Best Describes Advisory Council Chairmen												
A. Parent	56	37	39	38	37	25	39	42	33	39	48	45
B. Staff	2	4	1	0	3	1	0	0	2	3	2	1
C. *Student	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D. Resident	0	1	5	0	2	1	2	0	2	1	0	1
E. Business/Professional	2	8	0	6	2	6	2	3	4	0	0	1
F. Organization	1	6	2	1	0	4	0	2	2	1	2	2
VII. Advisory Council Meetings												
A. Weekly	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
B. Bi-Weekly	0	1	1	1	2	0	1	2	1	2	2	3
C. Monthly	52	49	42	38	39	32	39	37	34	38	46	42
D. Bi-Monthly	10	1	0	5	3	1	1	2	7	3	4	3
E. Unscheduled, only as needed	0	5	2	1	0	4	2	5	1	1	0	2

*Applies only to secondary schools

VIII. Advisory Council Meetings

	Administrative Areas											
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
A. Day	10	16	8	3	3	2	4	8	0	0	0	5
B. Night	45	31	39	39	41	34	34	34	40	42	52	45
C. Both Day or Night	7	9	0	3	0	1	5	5	3	2	0	0

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

February 14, 1972

TO: Area Superintendents

FROM: Wilson Jordan

SUBJECT: EVALUATION OF ADVISORY COUNCILS - REPORT NO. 3

The attached questionnaire for the third report on advisory councils is being distributed at this time with the suggestion that you may wish to discuss its content with your principals at your next area principals meeting. By presenting this information to principals at this early date, community advisory councils will have more time for planning and discussion of these significant subject areas.

The time schedule for Report No. 3 is as follows:

February 16 - March 3	Distribution of forms to principals by Area Superintendents
March 21	Forwarding of forms by principals to Area Superintendents by this date
March 28	Forwarding of summary form by Area Superintendents to the Education and Management Assessment Office by this date
April 6	Report to the Board of Education by the Education and Management Assessment Office

WKJ:an

c.c. Dr. Graham Sullivan
Mr. James Taylor
Dr. Robert Purdy

February, 1972

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

SCHOOL COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL - REPORT NO. 3

School _____ Area _____

I. BY-LAWS--Indicate the degree to which the Advisory Council has established by-laws or working guidelines.

(Choose one)

A. Have established by-laws or working guidelines ☐

B. Have begun to develop by-laws or working guidelines ☐

C. Have not begun the discussion of by-laws or working guidelines ☐

II. GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND PRIORITIES

A Indicate the degree to which the Advisory Council has begun to establish goals, objectives and priorities for the school.

(Choose one)

1. Have established goals, objectives and priorities ☐

2. Have begun the process of establishing goals, objectives and priorities ☐

3. Have not begun the discussion of goals, objectives and priorities ☐

B. Indicate the Advisory Council's goals, objectives and priorities if they have been established.

_____

_____

_____

_____

III. IN-SERVICE TRAINING

A. Has in-service training for Advisory Council members taken place? Yes ___

No ___

If answer is "yes," please respond to the following:

B. Indicate the number of in-service training meetings in which Advisory Council members have been involved _____

C. Indicate the person(s) who have assumed leadership roles for conducting the discussions or in-service training sessions related to the Advisory Council

District staff _____

Area staff _____

Principal _____

Vice principal _____

Teachers _____

Chairman _____

Community person _____

Other _____

_____

_____

D. Indicate the subject areas discussed during leadership or training sessions

By-laws _____

Goals, objectives, priorities _____

Decentralization _____

Area administration _____

School administration structure and supportive service _____

Curriculum _____

Budget _____

Public School Finance _____

Counseling and guidance _____

Parliamentary procedures _____

Other _____

_____

Principal's Signature _____

RETURN TO AREA SUPERINTENDENT ON OR BEFORE MARCH 21, 1972.

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

February, 1972

TO: School Principals

FROM: Area Superintendent

SUBJECT: SCHOOL COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL - REPORT NO. 3

The policy statement adopted by the Board of Education with regard to Advisory Councils provides that a primary purpose of a council shall be to advise the principal in matters pertaining to the school and its educational program. Through the assessment of educational needs and by establishing goals, objectives and priorities for those needs a council can materially assist in providing a quality educational program for every pupil.

This questionnaire is intended to determine the extent and degree to which a local school advisory council, at this point in time, has been able to determine effective operating procedures, establish its primary goals, objectives and priorities and to initiate in-service programs for council members. These emphases become highly significant as steps are taken to evaluate the effectivenss of advisory councils at the end of the present school year.

The time schedule for Report No. 3 is as follows:

February 16 - March 3	Distribution of forms to principals by Area Superintendents
March 21	Forwarding of forms by principals to Area Superintendents by this date

WKJ:an

Attach.

February, 1972

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL - AREA SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT NO. 3

SUMMARY FORM

AREA _____ Total Number of Schools _____

I. BY-LAWS--Indicate the degree that school advisory councils have established by-laws or working guidelines

	No. of Schools
A. Have established by-laws or working guidelines	_____
B. Have begun to develop by-laws or working guidelines	_____
C. Have not begun the process of establishing by-laws or working guidelines	_____

II. GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND PRIORITIES--Indicate the degree that school advisory councils have begun to establish goals, objectives and priorities

A. Have established goals, objectives and priorities	_____
B. Have begun the process of establishing goals, objectives and priorities	_____
C. Have not begun the process of establishing goals, objectives and priorities	_____

III. IN-SERVICE TRAINING--Indicate the degree that advisory councils have been involved in in-service training

A. The number of schools that have held in-service training for advisory councils	_____

B. The extent to which schools have been involved in in-service training sessions

No. of Sessions	
1	_____
2	_____
3	_____
4	_____
5 or more	_____

C. Indicate the person(s) who have assumed leadership roles for conducting discussions or in-service training sessions related to school advisory councils

	No. of Schools
District staff	
Area staff	
Principal	
Vice principal	
Teachers	
Chairman	
Community persons	
Other	

D. Indicate the subject areas discussed during leadership or training sessions

By-laws	
Goals, objectives, priorities	
Decentralization	
Area administration	
School administration structure and supportive service	
Curriculum	
Budget	
Public School Finance	
Counseling and guidance	
Parliamentary procedures	
Other	

Area Superintendent's Signature _____

RETURN BY MARCH 28, 1972, TO: Dr. Wilson Jordan
Education and Management Assessment Office

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

LOS ANGELES CITY SCHOOLS

TO: Members of the Board of Education Date April 20, 1972

FROM: Dr. William Johnston

SUBJECT: COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL REPORT NO. 3

The following information represents the third of a series of progress reports on the organization and formation of community advisory councils under Board Rule 1370.

The previous reports defined the status of school advisory councils and identified organizational patterns of councils. This report provides information relative to the extent that councils have been able to develop by-laws, define educational needs and begin in-service training of staff and community members.

Dr. Hardy's appointed committee has developed a questionnaire to evaluate the effectiveness of advisory councils. The questionnaire has been sent to more than 150 professional and community representatives who have been asked to make suggestions for the final necessary revision of the instrument. This will have a wide distribution to principals, advisory council chairmen and council members for a final evaluation and a concluding report to the Board of Education is planned for the early part of June.

WJJ:an

Attach.

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

SCHOOL COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL REPORT #3

	Administrative Areas											
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
I. TOTAL NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	62	56	47	45	44	37	43	47	43	44	52	50
II. BY-LAWS												
A. Schools that have established by-laws or working guidelines	42	25	26	15	29	20	25	34	33	33	37	40
B. Schools that have begun to develop by-laws or working guidelines	15	21	14	30	12	16	16	13	10	9	14	10
C. Schools that have not begun the process of establishing by-laws or working guidelines	5	10	7	0	3	1	2	0	0	2	1	0
III. COALS, OBJECTIVES AND PRIORITIES												
A. Schools that have established goals, objectives and priorities	15	19	13	28	20	11	7	16	4	12	17	13
B. Schools that have begun the process of establishing goals, objectives and priorities	38	33	28	17	22	33	21	24	34	28	30	29
C. Schools that have not begun the process of establishing goals, objectives and priorities	9	4	6	0	2	3	15	7	5	4	7	8
IV. IN-SERVICE TRAINING												
A. Schools that have held in-service training for advisory councils	27	29	18	10	15	17	27	21	19	10	15	42
B. Number of sessions in which schools have been involved in in-service training												
One Session	6	3	2	1	4	6	2	3	5	5	3	22
Two Sessions	4	6	2	2	4	1	2	5	5	4	7	7
Three Sessions	6	4	4	2	0	4	4	7	4	1	2	9
Four Sessions	5	3	1	0	1	1	4	2	5	0	1	2
Five or More Sessions	6	13	9	5	6	5	15	4	0	0	2	2

	Administrative Areas											
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
C. Identification of leader for discussions or in-service training sessions related to school advisory councils												
District staff	2	7	7	3	1	1	8	5	0	1	2	5
Area staff	3	11	9	3	6	1	18	5	3	1	2	10
Principal	32	24	10	18	9	12	22	21	36	12	20	31
Vice-Principal	12	10	5	4	1	2	11	2	6	2	2	5
Teachers	25	14	9	14	4	8	25	16	20	9	9	18
Chairman	18	13	7	15	9	7	9	12	21	8	12	15
Community persons	8	16	9	7	3	5	9	11	11	2	6	5
Other	0	0	4	3	5	3	0	0	0	0	3	5
D. Subject areas discussed during leadership or training sessions												
By-laws	24	15	8	0	9	12	17	17	35	13	20	31
Goals, objectives, priorities	22	24	14	0	11	12	22	19	33	11	19	27
Decentralization	22	10	6	9	4	6	9	9	17	7	12	18
Area administration	9	11	3	5	4	2	5	8	12	5	7	11
School administration structure and supportive service	18	16	9	7	8	7	16	12	16	4	11	14
Curriculum	26	22	15	16	10	9	25	16	24	8	13	22
Budget	19	21	13	6	10	6	18	10	18	5	11	15
Public school finance	11	12	2	0	6	4	7	3	9	5	4	11
Counseling and guidance	13	14	9	7	3	2	16	7	8	5	4	11
Parliamentary procedures	12	15	6	7	4	7	3	10	14	1	6	12
Other	0	0	0	13	2	0	0	0	2	0	4	9

APPENDIX B

survey questionnaire
short-form questionnaire

SCHOOL COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

OFFICE OF EDUCATION AND
MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT

MAY 1972

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

On February 24, 1972, Dr. Georgiana Hardy, Chairman of the Community Affairs Committee of the Board of Education, appointed an ad hoc committee of six persons to work with the Office of Education and Management Assessment in developing a questionnaire for evaluating the effectiveness of advisory councils. The committee consisted of:

Name	Organization
Mrs. Murray Foster	31st District PTA
Mr. John Glynn	Granada Hills High Teacher
Mrs. Harry Jerison	League of Women Voters
Mr. John Jackson	Los Angeles High Advisory Council
Mrs. Robert Neiman	Birmingham High Advisory Council
Mr. Alfonso Perez	Area H Administrative Coordinator
Dr. Wilson Jordan, Chairman	Educ. and Mgmt. Assessment Office

The work of the committee resulted in a preliminary draft of this questionnaire which was sent to nearly two hundred professional and community representatives throughout the school district. Each was asked to make suggestions for revisions. Based on the helpful and significant responses from that group, the committee developed this final revision of the survey questionnaire.

A special note of appreciation is expressed to the committee and to the many representatives of our district and our school community who gave of tneir time and effort and shared in the development of this survey questionnaire.

We also wish to acknowledge the special consultant services of Mr. James Browne, Claremont College Graduate School, who assisted the committee in its work.

LOS ANGELES CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD
DONALD D. NEWMAN, PRESIDENT
PHILLIP BARDOS
J. C. CHAMBERS
ROBERT DOCTER
RICHARD FERRARO
GEORGIANA HARDY
JULIAN NAVA

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES
450 NORTH GRAND AVENUE
P. O. BOX 3307
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90051
687-4301

WILLIAM J. JOHNSTON
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

WILSON K. JORDAN
ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT
EDUCATION AND MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT
687-4820

May 17, 1972

Dear Advisory Council Member:

We would like to ask that you take a short period of your time to respond to the attached questionnaire because your reactions, as a 1972-73 school year advisory council participant, will provide the district with the information necessary for improving the future effectiveness of the school community advisory council program.

As you are perhaps aware, on June 28, 1971, the Los Angeles City Board of Education mandated, under Board Rule 1370, that each elementary and secondary school should provide for the establishment and operation of a School Community Advisory Council.

This questionnaire is being distributed to all principals, advisory council chairmen and to a random sampling of advisory council members throughout our school district to assist in the evaluation effort.

In the appendix at the end of this questionnaire, we have included the specific information contained in Board Rule 1370 which was adopted as a basis for the establishment for the organization and operation of advisory councils.

Realizing that it is possible for a person to serve on more than one advisory council, we are asking that your responses apply to membership on only one council.

An addressed and stamped return envelope has been enclosed for advisory council chairmen, secondary students, parents, and community representatives. School personnel are asked to return the envelopes through school mail. All surveys should be returned not later than Tuesday, May 30, 1972. Please do NOT place your name or the name of your school on either the questionnaire or the return envelope.

We sincerely thank you for your cooperation and willingness to help us with this important evaluation.

Sincerely,

Wilson K. Jordan
Assistant Superintendent

SCHOOL COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL SURVEY

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. The information requested below is readily available from the school principal.

   a. School enrollment total (as indicated in the Racial and Ethnic Survey, Fall, 1971, Report No. 319)

   _____
   Enrollment

   b. Administrative area (please circle appropriate area)

   A B C D E F G H I J K L

   c. Type of school (Check one)

   ☐ Elementary

   ☐ Junior High

   ☐ Senior High

   ☐ Special Education

   ☐ Adult

   d. Indicate the ethnic make-up of the student body of your school, using the figures provided in the Racial and Ethnic Survey, Fall, 1971, Report No. 319.

   American Indian _____%

   Black _____%

   Oriental _____%

   Spanish Surname _____%

   Filipino and Other Minorities _____%

   White (Other than Spanish Surname) _____%

2. Check the box which identifies your primary role as an advisory council member. (Some of you may have more than one role; however, please select only your primary identification as a council member.)

- ☐ Chairman
- ☐ Principal
- ☐ Parent
- ☐ Community representative
- ☐ Certificated school staff
- ☐ Classified school staff
- ☐ Student

COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL ORGANIZATION

1. What was the most effective method used to inform you about the requirement that an official community advisory council was to be established this school year (Board Rule 1370)? (Check one)

- ☐ School staff (informal contact)
- School notice
- ☐ ---Sent by U. S. Mail
- ☐ ---Sent home by pupils
- ☐ PTA or other parent group notice
- ☐ Newspaper
- ☐ Not informed
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

_____

_____

2. How well were you informed about the Board's requirement that advisory councils be formed (Board Rule 1370)? (Check one)

- ☐ Very well
- ☐ Somewhat
- ☐ Poorly
- ☐ Not at all

3. When was your school's council formed under the guidelines presented in Board Rule 1370? (Check one)

- ☐ Before December 1, 1971
- ☐ After December 1, 1971
- ☐ Don't know

4. How long before the adoption of Board Rule 1370 (June, 1971) did your school have some form of advisory council? (Check one)

- ☐ Under two years
- ☐ Two to four years
- ☐ Five years or more
- ☐ Never
- ☐ Don't know

5. How many people turned out for meetings to plan your advisory council? (Check one)

- ☐ Under 25
- ☐ 26-50
- ☐ 51-100
- ☐ Over 100
- ☐ Don't know
- ☐ No meeting held

6. To what extent was the District's Handbook for School Community Advisory Councils used in establishing or reorganizing your advisory council under Board Rule 1370? (Check one)

- ☐ Our council was formed before the handbook was printed
- ☐ Did not have available
- ☐ Had available but did not use
- ☐ Used only in a general way
- ☐ Depended on heavily

7. Indicate how a person could qualify as a candidate for advisory council membership. (Check appropriate boxes)

- ☐ File application
- ☐ Submit signed petition
- ☐ Submit biographical data to voters
- ☐ Nomination by attending an open meeting
- ☐ Secure approval from the principal
- ☐ Live in specified area
- ☐ Other (please explain)_____

8. Which procedure represents the method used to select you as a member of your advisory council? (Check one)

- ☐ Appointed

  Elected by

- ☐ ---Ballot at announced meeting
- ☐ ---Ballot vote at polls
- ☐ ---Open vote at meeting (hand/voice)
- ☐ Other (please explain)_____

9. Which procedure represents the method used to select your advisory council chairman? (Check one)

- ☐ Appointed

  Elected by

- ☐ ---Mail ballot
- ☐ ---Ballot vote at announced meeting
- ☐ ---Open vote at meeting (hand/voice)
- ☐ Continued as chairman from an earlier council
- ☐ Other (please explain)_____

10. For each of the categories below please check the box which best indicates the amount of participation which occurred in your advisory council election(s).

COUNCIL MEMBERS	ELECTION TURNOUT				Appointed or No Election Held
	Very Little	Adequate	Large	Don't Know	
a. Advisory Council Chairman					
b. Parents					
c. Community Representatives					
d. School Support Groups (e.g., PTA, Booster Clubs, etc.)					
e. Certificated School Staff					
f. Classified School Staff					
g. Students					

COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL STRUCTURE

1. Which statement describes the type of advisory council your school now has? (Check one)

   ☐ Our advisory council is newly formed

   ☐ Our advisory council has remained as it was organized prior to Board Rule 1370

   ☐ Our existing advisory council was reorganized by the appointment or election of additional members

   ☐ Don't know

2. For each of the categories below please indicate the number of advisory council members of each sex.

TYPE OF MEMBER (Primary Role)	Sex		TOTAL NUMBER
	Male	Female	
a. Advisory Council Chairman			
b. Parents			
c. Community Representatives			
d. School Support Groups, (e.g., PTA, Booster Clubs, etc.)			
e. Certificated School Staff			
f. Classified School Staff			
g. Students			
TOTAL			

3. For each of the racial/ethnic categories listed below please estimate the number of members of your advisory council representing each group.

TYPE OF MEMBER	Ethnic Background						
	American Indian	Black	Oriental	Spanish Surname	Filipino and Other Minorities	White (other than Spanish Surname)	Don't Know
a. Advisory Council Chairman							
b. Parents							
c. Community Representatives							
d. School Support Groups (e.g., PTA, Booster Clubs)							
e. Certificated School Staff (excluding the principal)							
f. Classified School Staff							
g. Students							

4. **Does your advisory council have subcommittees?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know

5. For each of the categories below please indicate the number of advisory council members "elected" and "appointed."

TYPE OF MEMBER	How Selected		TOTAL NUMBER
	Elected	Appointed	
a. Advisory Council Chairman			
b. Parents			
c. Community Representatives			
d. School Support Groups (e.g., PTA, Booster Clubs)			
e. Certificated School Staff (excluding the principal)			
f. Classified School Staff			
g. Students			
TOTALS			

COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL OPERATION

1. Estimate the number of advisory council members who usually attend your regularly scheduled advisory council meetings. (Check one)

- ☐ Under 10
- ☐ 11-25
- ☐ 26-50
- ☐ Over 50
- ☐ Don't know

2. Estimate the number of non-council members who usually attend your regularly scheduled advisory council meetings. (Check one)

- ☐ Under 10
- ☐ 11-25
- ☐ 26-50
- ☐ 51-100
- ☐ Over 100
- ☐ Don't know

3. What is the present stage of development of by-laws (operating procedures) for your advisory council? (Check one)

- ☐ Adopted and in use
- ☐ Being developed
- ☐ Being revised
- ☐ Undeveloped as yet
- ☐ No plans to develop
- ☐ Don't know

4. How often does your advisory council usually meet? (Check one)

- ☐ Weekly
- ☐ Every two weeks
- ☐ Monthly
- ☐ Every two months
- ☐ Other (explain) _____

5. When are your advisory council meetings held? (Check one)

- ☐ Day
- ☐ Evening
- ☐ Both

6. Which of the methods iisted below has been the most effective way of informing you about advisory council meetings? (Check one)

- ☐ Notice sent home with pupils
- ☐ U. S. mail
- ☐ Telephone
- ☐ Newspaper
- ☐ School notice/meeting
- ☐ Council, PTA or other parent group notice
- ☐ School staff (informal contact)
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

7. What opportunity do non-council members have to participate in the discussion of topics at advisory council meetings? (Check one)

- ☐ Opportunity always exists
- ☐ Opportunity usually exists
- ☐ Opportunity sometimes exists
- ☐ Opportunity doesn't exist

8. What opportunity do non-council members have to introduce topics for discussion at advisory council meetings? (Check one)

- ☐ Opportunity always exists
- ☐ Opportunity usually exists
- ☐ Opportunity sometimes exists
- ☐ Opportunity doesn't exist

9. What opportunity do non-council members have to serve on an advisory council subcommittee? (Check one)

- ☐ Opportunity always exists
- ☐ Opportunity usually exists
- ☐ Opportunity sometimes exists
- ☐ Opportunity doesn't exist

10. Which procedures are used in publicizing the minutes of your advisory council meetings? (Check appropriate boxes)

- ☐ Minutes are recorded and available at school
- ☐ Minutes are recorded and read at the next advisory council meeting
- ☐ Minutes are mailed to advisory council members
- ☐ No minutes are kept
- ☐ Other (explain) _____

11. Which procedures are used in distributing the summaries of your advisory council meetings? (Check appropriate boxes)

- ☐ Summaries are sent home with pupils
- ☐ Summaries are posted for staff and community to read
- ☐ Summaries are published in the local newspaper
- ☐ No summaries are prepared
- ☐ Other (explain) _____

12. What is the primary source of funds and/or materials for the operation of your council? (Check one)

- ☐ None
- ☐ Contributions from council members
- ☐ Outside donations
- ☐ School supplies
- ☐ Title I
- ☐ Area Office
- ☐ Other (please explain) _____

REACTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. What is your reaction to the procedure used to select your advisory council members? (Check one)

- ☐ Highly satisfied
- ☐ Satisfied
- ☐ Somewhat dissatisfied
- ☐ Highly dissatisfied
- ☐ Don't know what procedures were used

2. If you were dissatisfied with the procedures used to select the members of your advisory council, which reason represents your primary source of concern? (Check one)

- ☐ Election controlled by a small group
- ☐ Election controlled by the principal
- ☐ Eligible voters were not informed about the election
- ☐ Voting times were inconvenient
- ☐ Not dissatisfied
- ☐ Other (explain) _____

_____

3. What is your reaction to the procedure used to conduct your council meetings? (Check one)

- ☐ Highly satisfied
- ☐ Satisfied
- ☐ Somewhat dissatisfied
- ☐ Highly dissatisfied

4. In your opinion is your council representative of the ethnic/racial composition of the student body of your school? (Check one)

- ☐ Highly representative
- ☐ Somewhat representative
- ☐ Not representative
- ☐ No opinion

5. What is your opinion regarding the frequency of the meetings of your advisory council? (Check one)

- ☐ Too frequent
- ☐ About right
- ☐ Not frequent enough
- ☐ No opinion

6. For each of the advisory council functions listed below, indicate the extent to which your council has been involved. (Refer to functions 1-8 in Appendix, pages i-iii, at the end of this survey.)

		Amount Discussed (Check one box for each of the eleven items listed)				
Refer to function:	HAS YOUR ADVISORY COUNCIL:	Much	Some	Little	None	Don't Know
1, page ii	Participated in the identification of educational needs?					
1, page ii	Advised on the resource needs of schools (e.g., staff, materials, and funds)?					
2, page ii	Made recommendations regarding the planning, development or improvement of school educational programs? (i.e., curriculum recommendations)					
2, page ii	Made budgetary recommendations to meet educational program needs?					
3, page ii	Participated in the definition of educational goals, objectives and priorities?					
3, page ii	Advised on the use of specific indicators that would show progress toward educational objectives (e.g., standardized tests, parent surveys)?					
4, page ii	Oriented and advised school staff regarding conditions in the community (e.g., vandalism, drug abuse)?					
5, page iii	Participated in the development of policies affecting the interests and welfare of pupils (e.g., discipline, homework, grading practices, etc.)?					
6, page iii	Facilitated school communication with parents and citizens? (i.e., school community relations)					
7, page iii	Assisted in securing the support and services of parents, teachers, and students? (i.e., mobilized public support for the school)					
8, page iii	Participated in the evaluation of the school and its academic effectiveness and made recommendations to the Superintendent for improvement? (e.g., on reading achievement level)					

7. For each of the advisory council functions listed below, indicate your evaluation of the extent to which your council has been effective (i.e., proposals that have been acted upon by the principal). (Refer to functions 1-8 in Appendix, pages i-iii, at the end of this survey.)

(Check one box for each of the eleven items listed)

Refer to function:	HAS YOUR ADVISORY COUNCIL:	Effective	Not Effective	Too Early to Evaluate
1, page ii	Participated in the identification of educational needs?			
1, page ii	Advised on the resource needs of schools (e.g., staff, materials, and funds)?			
2, page ii	Made recommendations regarding the planning, development or improvement of school educational programs? (i.e., curriculum recommendations)			
2, page ii	Made budgetary recommendations to meet educational program needs?			
3, page ii	Participated in the definition of educational goals, objectives and priorities?			
3, page ii	Advised on the use of specific indicators that would show progress toward educational objectives (e.g., standardized tests, parent surveys)?			
4, page ii	Oriented and advised school staff regarding conditions in the community (e.g., vandalism, drug abuse)?			
5, page ii	Participated in the development of policies affecting the interests and welfare of pupils (e.g., discipline, homework, grading practices, etc.)?			
6, page iii	Facilitated school communication with parents and citizens? (i.e., school community relations)			
7, page iii	Assisted in securing the support and services of parents, teachers, and students? (i.e., mobilized public support for the school)			
8, page iii	Participated in the evaluation of the school and its academic effectiveness and made recommendations to the Superintendent for improvement? (e.g., on reading achievement level)			

8. For each of the council members listed below indicate on a rating of 4 (1 = excellent; 2 = good; 3 = satisfactory; 4 = poor) the amount of cooperation among advisory council members. (Place a rating in each box for each column.)

Level of Cooperation Between	Principal	Chairman	Parents	Community Representative	Certificated School Staff	Classified School Staff	Students
Principal							
Chairman							
Parents							
Community Representative							
Certificated School Staff							
Classified School Staff							
Students							

AND

9. Please state reasons why you believe your advisory council has been effective or ineffective this year.

10. Please make suggestions which you believe will improve your school community advisory council.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please seal your survey in the enclosed envelope and return not later than Tuesday, May 30, 1972.

(a) An addressed, stamped envelope has been enclosed for advisory council chairmen, secondary students, parents and community representatives.

(b) Principals and school staff are asked to return the envelope through school mail.

(c) Please do NOT place your name or the name of your school on the envelope.

Thank you for your time and effort in completing and mailing this survey.

APPENDIX

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Present Policy

On June 28, 1971, the Board of Education established policy regarding School-Community Advisory Councils. The Board Rule and guidelines for implementation are as follows:

> Board Rule 1370. Principals of elementary and secondary schools in cooperation with the school staff, parents, other community representatives and students (secondary schools) shall provide for the establishment and operation of a School-Community Advisory Council. Each council shall be composed of no fewer than eleven members including members elected by the groups they represent. Provision for additional elected or appointed members may be made by each school community and school staff in cooperation with the principal.

Advisory Council Mandated

In order to provide for the involvement of all who are concerned with the decisions affecting the educational program of the school, it is required that each principal, in cooperation with the staff, parents, community representatives and students (secondary schools) decide upon a mutually acceptable plan for a school-community advisory group.

Guidelines

The following minimum guidelines shall be followed in regard to the structure, function, and rules of operation of each advisory council.

1. Existing Councils. Existing advisory councils may be maintained to meet this requirement subject to the following provisions:

   a. Where such councils are presently elected, provision may be made for the appointment by existing school support groups of up to three members provided that such appointments by school support groups may not exceed thirty percent of the total membership of the advisory council. (A school support group is defined as any group identifying with an individual school for the purpose of school-community contact or joint activity which has been in existence for at least two years prior to September 1, 1971, and has held meetings at least quarterly during the period of its existence.

b. Where such councils are presently appointed provision shall be made for the election of three at-large community representatives not to exceed a total of forty percent of the membership of the school advisory council, to be so elected in the first year.

c. As to all existing councils of types referred to above, election of at least one faculty representative by the faculty and in the secondary schools at least one students' representative elected by the students of the school shall be provided.

2. New Councils. New councils, where established, may be elected or may be a combination of elected and appointed members, provided that the majority of such new councils shall be parents of students enrolled at the school and elected by the community and that appointment may be made by existing school support groups, the faculty and students (secondary schools). Students and faculty representatives shall be elected by vote of the students and faculty, respectively. Such new councils shall be formed at the latest by December 1, 1971.

Function

The purpose of a School-Community Advisory Council shall be to advise the principal in matters pertaining to the school and its educational program. The group is a resource to the principal, who remains responsible for decisions which are necessary in the administration and supervision of the school. The following functions will be performed by advisory councils as a minimum. Each council and local school principal may subsequently agree on additional functions.

1. Participate in the assessment of educational needs, establishment of priorities, and advise on the resource needs of the schools.

2. Make recommendations regarding the planning of a school educational program and the budget resources available for it.

3. Contribute to the definition of educational objectives and to the specificiation of indicators to show progress toward objectives.

4. Orient and advise school staff regarding conditions in the community.

5. Advise principals regarding policies affecting the interests and welfare of pupils.

6. Facilitate school communication with parents and citizens and mobilize public support for the school.

7. Assist in securing the support and services of parents, teachers, and students.

8. Participate in the evaluation of the school and its academic effectiveness and make recommendations to the Superintendent for improvement.

Rules of Operation

Each school advisory council shall establish its own rules regarding the time and place of meeting, quorum requirements, and the means of publicizing its actions, provided that no fewer than six meetings shall be held in a school year and that all meetings shall be open to the public and on adequate notice. The council shall elect its own presiding officer. The principal shall be an ex-officio nonvoting member.

Inservice Training

The Superintendent shall provide a program of staff development/inservice training for school and community personnel to ensure understanding of the objectives and processes of each council and to promote their successful implementation.

Conflict Mediation

The Superintendent shall provide for the mediation of disputes arising between a school advisory council and a local school administration through the area superintendent's office or central office staff, provided that the Board of Education shall be the final arbiter of unresolved conflicts.

Evaluation

The Superintendent shall recommend to the Board of Education an evaluation program which shall provide an evaluation of the effectiveness of each school council and may make recommendations relative thereto. All existing councils shall be evaluated by the end of the School Year 1971-72, and all new councils shall be evaluated by the end of the second year of their existence.

LOS ANGELES CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD
DONALD D. NEWMAN, PRESIDENT
PHILLIP BARDOS
J. C. CHAMBERS
ROBERT DOCTER
RICHARD FERRARO
GEORGIANA HARDY
JULIAN NAVA

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES
450 NORTH GRAND AVENUE
P. O. BOX 3307
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90051
687-4301

WILLIAM J. JOHNSTON
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

WILSON K. JORDAN
ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT
EDUCATION AND MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT
687-4820

May 30, 1972

Dear Member of the School Community:

As you probably know, a survey on School-Community Advisory Councils was sent to each elementary and secondary school principal, advisory council chairman and to a randomly selected group of community representatives, parents, teachers, classified staff members and secondary students.

To provide an additional opportunity for other members of the school community to share in the evaluation of the organization and operation of School-Community Advisory Councils, we have prepared this more concise questionnaire of items which will be helpful in assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the advisory councils.

The time and effort you spend in filling out and mailing this questionnaire will be greatly appreciated. We ask that you do not identify your school or yourself on either the questionnaire or the return envelope. Please send in your completed questionnaire before June 9, 1972 to:

(School Mail)

Office of Education and
Management Assessment
Room A-319

or

(U. S. Mail)

Office of Education and
Management Assessment (A-319)
P. O. Box 3307
Los Angeles, California 90051

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Wilson K. Jordan
Assistant Superintendent

WKJ:di
Enc.

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT May 30, 1972

QUESTIONNAIRE ON SCHOOL-COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCILS

1. The background information requested below will be helpful in assessing special concerns related to school-community advisory councils.

   a. Estimate of enrollment - _____

   b. Type of school (Check one) - ___Elementary ___Special Education
   ___Junior High ___Adult School
   ___Senior High

   c. Administrative area (Circle one) - A B C D E F G H I J K L

2. Please indicate your relationship to the school. (Check where appropriate)

   ___Advisory council member ___Live in the community
   ___Parent of child in the school ___Member of the certificated staff
   ___Community representative ___Member of the classified staff
   ___Employed in the community ___Student

   ___Other (Please explain) _____

3. To what extent do you feel the publicity related to the announcement of meetings, the publication of agenda, and the summaries of council business is effective? (Check one)

   ___Very effective ___Adequate ___Inadequate ___No opinion

4. To what extent were you satisfied with the attempt to follow the advisory council organization and operating procedures as established in Board Rule 1370?

   ___Highly satisfied ___Highly dissatisfied
   ___Satisfied ___Don't know the procedures in Board
   ___Somewhat dissatisfied Rule 1370

5. How are you informed about advisory council meetings? (Check appropriate boxes)

   ___Notice sent home with pupil ___School Staff (informal contact)
   ___U.S. Mail ___Parent group newsletter
   ___Telephone ___Other (Please specify)_____
   ___Newspaper _____

6. What is your reaction to the procedure used to select advisory council members?

   ___Highly satisfied ___Highly dissatisfied
   ___Satisfied ___Don't know what procedures were used
   ___Somewhat dissatisfied

7. What is your reaction to the procedure used to select the advisory council chairman?

   ___Highly satisfied ___Highly dissatisfied
   ___Satisfied ___Don't know what procedures were used
   ___Somewhat dissatisfied

8. What is your reaction to the procedure used to conduct your advisory council meetings?

____Highly satisfied
____Satisfied
____Somewhat dissatisfied
____Highly dissatisfied
____Don't know what procedures were used

9. In your opinion is your advisory council representative of the co osition of the student body of your school? (Check one)

____Highly representative
____Not representative
____Somewhat representative
____No opinion

10. What opportunity do non-council members have to participate in the discussion of topics at advisory council meetings? (Check one)

____Opportunity always exists
____Opportunity usually exists
____Opportunity sometimes exists
____Opportunity doesn't exist

11. What opportunity do non-council members have to introduce topics for discussion at advisory council meetings? (Check one)

____Opportunity always exists
____Opportunity usually exists
____Opportunity sometimes exists
____Opportunity doesn't exist

12. Please state reasons why you believe your advisory council has been effective or ineffective this year.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

13. Please make suggestions which you believe will improve your school-community advisory council.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for your time and effort in completing and mailing this questionnaire. (Send to: Office of Education and Management Assessment (A-319) before June 9, 1972.)